imph
ib. Lit
C.

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL STUDIE
VI

THE STYLE AND LITERARY METHOD OF LUKE

I
THE DICTION OF LUKE AND ACTS

BY

HENRY J. CADBURY

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND OF GREEK
HAVERFORD COLLEGE

16 200 S.
19.5.21

CAMBRIDGE
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
1919

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

EDITED FOR THE

FACULTY OF DIVINITY

IN

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

BY

GEORGE F. MOORE, JAMES H. ROPES,
KIRSOPP LAKE

CAMBRIDGE
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
1919

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL STUDIES
VI

THE STYLE AND LITERARY METHOD OF LUKE

I
THE DICTION OF LUKE AND ACTS

BY

HENRY J. CADBURY

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND OF GREEK
HAVERFORD COLLEGE

CAMBRIDGE
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
1919

Printed at
Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

COPYRIGHT, 1919
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

PREFATORY NOTE

THE investigation of which the First Part is here published was made in the years 1911 to 1913, and submitted as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Harvard University in 1913. Publication has been unavoidably delayed, and it seems best not to postpone longer the issue of the present part, on the Diction of Luke, which has a certain unity and completeness of its own. The Second Part will deal with Luke's treatment of his sources, Mark and "Q," especially from a literary point of view, and with the style of Luke as illustrated by parallels in the Gospel and Acts. This second and larger part of the work will be published as soon as conditions growing out of the war permit; if the hopes of the editors are fulfilled, within the next few months. It will contain the author's preface and a table of contents to the whole, which can then be bound in one volume.

G. F. M.
J. H. R.
K. L.

CONTENTS

The Size of Luke's Vocabulary 1

Literary Standard of the Vocabulary 4

The Alleged Medical Language of Luke 39

Notes 51

Excursus: Medical Terms in Lucian 65

Notes 71

THE STYLE AND LITERARY METHOD OF LUKE

PART I

THE DICTION OF LUKE AND ACTS

1. SIZE OF LUKE'S VOCABULARY

THE size of Luke's vocabulary has been reckoned several times in various ways, with results which approximately agree. According to the latest count, by Professor Goodspeed, the Gospel of Luke contains 2080 different words, Acts 2054. Luke and Acts use in common 1014 words, and the total vocabulary of Luke and Acts together is 3120.[1] The earlier count by J. Ritchie Smith[2] to which Professor Goodspeed refers is in some ways more satisfactory. It omits proper names, and includes the figures for the other New Testament writers. According to this the total vocabulary of Luke and Acts is 2697.

Smith's complete table is as follows:

	Whole number of words	Total vocabulary	Words peculiar to each
Luke	35,239	2,697	715
Paul	31,457	2,446	797
John	27,185	1,396	212
Matthew	17,921	1,542	111
Mark	10,720	1,259	77
Hebrews	4,965	984	150
Peter	2,689	756	115
James	1,728	644	58
Jude	432	203	14

These figures enable us at a glance to compare Luke's vocabulary with that of the other New Testament writers; but, as Professor Goodspeed remarks, "they are disappointing to the critical student because they do not distinguish between Luke and Acts, between the

[1] *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XXXI (1912), pp. 92 ff.

[2] *Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, II (1891), pp. 647 ff.

Pastorals and the ten letters of the primary Pauline canon, or even between the Revelation and the Fourth Gospel."

For the book of Acts alone Blass's edition supplies a convenient lexicon and an enumeration of words. Excluding variant readings of the β-text and not counting proper names, there appear to be in Acts 1787 different words. For the Gospel of Luke by itself no exact count, excluding proper names, appears to be accessible. But the number of different words is very nearly the same as in Acts — approximately 1800. For the letters of Paul an independent count was made by Myron W. Adams.[1]

These figures show that Luke's vocabulary is greater than that of any other New Testament writer. This is only natural, since he is the most voluminous writer (see the figures in the first column of the table above). The only fair test is to compare the figures for the Gospel of Matthew with those for Luke or Acts separately. These three works are of very nearly the same size, and yet either Luke or Acts has a vocabulary about one-sixth larger than that of Matthew.

The last column of Smith's table gives the number of words peculiar to each writer. The lists in Thayer's Lexicon differ somewhat from those in Smith, and as they make distinctions which Smith ignores, their totals are here given, together with some other counts of the same kind:

NUMBER OF WORDS PECULIAR TO INDIVIDUAL WRITERS

	Total	Thayer Dubious[3]	Thayer Minimum	Smith	Hawkins[2]	Various
Matt.	137	21	116	111	112	
Mark	102	32	70	77	71	80[4]
Luke						
Gospel	312	52	260		261	
Acts	478	49	429		413	414[5]
Gospel and Acts both	61		61		58	53[5]
Totals	851	101	750	715	732	

[1] *St. Paul's Vocabulary*, Hartford, 1895. His total of 2478, like Smith's, includes the Pastoral Epistles, but by means of his lists we have calculated that about 300 of the words he counts occur only in the Pastoral Epistles, so that the total for the ten primary letters is very nearly 2180.

[2] *Horae Synopticae*, 2d edit., pp. 198 ff.

[3] Uncertainty due to various readings.

[4] Swete, *St. Mark*, p. xl.

[5] Blass, *Acta Apostolorum, Editio philologica*, p. 334.

		Thayer		Smith	Hawkins[2]	Various
Pauline	Total	Dubious[3]	Minimum			
Except Pastoral Epistles	627	34	593			
Pastoral Epistles	197[1]	10	187			
Both groups	53	6	47			
Totals	877	50	827	797		816[2]
Johannine						
Gospel and Epistles	133	13	120			
Revelation	156	33	123			108[3]
Both groups	9	1	8			
Totals	298	47	251	212		
Hebrews	169	11	158	150		
James	73	9	64	58		
Peter	121	7	114	115		
Jude	20	1	19	14		

From these tables it appears that the words peculiar to Luke are more numerous than those peculiar to any other New Testament writer, unless the Pastoral Epistles with their great number of words not occurring elsewhere in the New Testament be included in the Pauline canon. Comparing books of equal size only we discover that in Matthew, Luke, and Acts the words peculiar to each book number respectively 116, 260, and 429, or thereabouts. Mr. Adams, using Mr. Smith's figures, calculates the ratio of words peculiar to each writer to his whole vocabulary. He says: "Of the total vocabulary of St. Paul the percentage of words peculiar to him, as far as the New Testament is concerned, is nearly 33. In the case of St. Luke it is nearly 27; in St. John and the author of Hebrews it is between 15 and 16; in the others, still less."[4]

This calculation, however, includes under Paul the Pastoral Epistles, which contain a large proportion of ἅπαξ λεγόμενα. If, following Thayer's figures, we exclude these, the percentages will be both about the same, between 27 and 28, as the following figures show:

	Total vocabulary	Words peculiar to either
Luke	2697	750
Paul	2170	593

[1] Thayer makes a mistake in the addition of his list.

[2] Adams, *op. cit.* p. 27.

[3] Swete, *Apocalypse*, p. cxix.

[4] *Op. cit.* p. 28.

Outside of the New Testament a few writers whose works are about the size of either or of both of Luke's works and whose vocabularies could be readily counted were examined with the following result:

About the Size of Luke or Acts Singly

	Teubner pages	Vocabulary
Luke	about 75	1800[1]
Acts	" 75	1787
Letter of Aristeas	" 65	1968
Deuteronomy	" 75	1200 (estimated)

About the Size of Luke and Acts Together

	Teubner pages	Vocabulary
Luke and Acts	150	2697
Xenophon, Memorabilia	142	2404
Xenophon, Anabasis i–iv	135	2431
Aeschines	190	*ca.* 3000
Antiphon	129	1550

2. LITERARY STANDARD OF LUKE'S VOCABULARY

The vocabulary of an author probably affords the best test for comparing him with the various degrees of education and elegance in contemporary speech and writing. In matters of orthography the corrections or corruptions of scribes obscure the original spelling of the autograph. Points of syntax can be more safely used to test a writer's style, but here anything like a statistical comparison is out of the question. But in the vocabulary of an ancient writer scribal changes play the smallest part, and a rough classification is to some extent possible. To estimate the literary standing of Luke it is very desirable to examine the character of his vocabulary.

This subject has already been studied in some connections; chiefly either as part of an investigation of the language of the New Testament, which has been compared as a whole rather than by separate writers with the classical Greek language, or in comparison with the diction of the other New Testament writers. These two methods have led to the following conclusions: *First*, that the Greek of the New Testament in general differs greatly from classical Greek and is on the whole of a more popular and uncultivated style, and,

[1] The figures are exclusive of proper names.

second, that the writings of Luke are rather more elegant in diction than most of the other writings in the New Testament. But both these methods of study have their limitations, and further and more definite judgments are possible in regard to the vocabulary of Luke. It should be studied separately, and not merely as part of the vocabulary of that very heterogeneous collection, the New Testament, and it should be compared with the vocabularies of other writers beside the few comprised in the Christian canon.

The simplest way of comparing the vocabularies of two writers is to discover how many words they have in common. Where lexica are available this is easily ascertained. The following list gives the approximate proportion of Luke's vocabulary found in several Hellenistic writers or collections:

Greek Comedy	67%
LXX, excluding Apocrypha	80
LXX, including Apocrypha	90
New Testament (exclusive of Luke and Acts)	70
Papyri	65
Lucian	70
Plutarch	85

Vogel [1] has made further observations in this field. Of the various parts of the Greek Old Testament, Judges, Samuel, and Kings show the closest resemblance in vocabulary to Luke; with Second Maccabees the likeness is very striking.[2] Among profane writers akin to Luke, Vogel notes especially Polybius, Dioscorides, and Josephus. The lexical relations between Luke and Josephus have been studied with especial fulness by Krenkel.[3] In the New Testament Paul and Hebrews show the closest likeness to Luke in vocabulary.[4]

Such facts and figures may perhaps show some relationship and are therefore not without significance, but they have decided limitations of value. Whether a word used by Luke occurs in another writing depends far more on the chance of subject matter and the size of the writings compared than on any real affinity of language.

[1] Vogel, *Zur Charakteristik des Lukas nach Sprache und Stil*, 2d edit., p. 11.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 54.

[3] M. Krenkel, *Josephus und Lucas. Der schriftstellerische Einfluss des jüdischen Geschichtsschreibers auf den christlichen nachgewiesen*, 1894.

[4] See for example the lists in Plummer, *Luke*, pp. liv ff.; Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, 2d edit., pp. 189 ff.

Furthermore, such collections as the Septuagint, the New Testament, the Apocrypha, and the papyri are of miscellaneous contents and character, the works of many authors, and do not represent a common standard of culture. Probably half of every writer's vocabulary is made up of words of such frequent occurrence that any other writer is likely to use them. It is only the unusual or uncommon words that can be expected to have much significance.

It is often inferred that for New Testament writers such words are to be found in the list of words peculiar to each writer, i. e., not found elsewhere in the New Testament. Such a notion is quite erroneous, and the emphasis usually placed upon these words in New Testament study seems to the present writer inappropriate. In a collection like the New Testament the occurrence of a word in only one writer is often merely an accident, and the words so distinguished are not characteristic of him.[1] On the other hand, some really unusual words or words of significance for a writer's vocabulary are thus left out of account because another writer in the New Testament happened to use the word.

If the fact that two writers have many words in common can not be used as a reliable evidence of affinity in vocabulary, it is still more dangerous to use this fact as a proof of literary dependence. Nowhere can this be more clearly seen than in the subject we are here considering, the vocabulary of Luke. Coincidence of vocabulary has been used at various times to prove that Luke wrote Hebrews, that he was familiar with Paul's letters, and that he had read Josephus or the Greek medical writers. Even the evidence of peculiar words is unsafe in such arguments, though it is used very effectively by both Krenkel and the believers in Luke's medical language. Krenkel, for example, to support his thesis that Luke had read Josephus, collects a large number of words which in the Greek Bible occur only in Luke and are also used by Josephus.[2]

The uncertainty of all such arguments may be illustrated by the following comparison of the vocabularies of Mark and Second Mac-

[1] The evidence that this is true may be seen by a glance at the lists in Part IV of the Appendix to Thayer's Lexicon. See what is said on this point below, p. 62, n. 78.

[2] *Josephus und Lucas*, pp. 304 ff. It is to be observed that Krenkel excludes from his investigation First and Second Maccabees. Were they included, many words would disappear from this list.

cabees as related to that of Luke. The two books are of about the same size. Mark we know was not only read by Luke but was made the chief source of his Gospel and in places copied verbatim; Second Maccabees may not even have been known to him. Yet according to the following figures, both in his general vocabulary and in the words peculiar to him, Luke has more in common with Second Maccabees than with Mark.

	Luke and Mark	Luke and 2 Macc.
Whole number of words in common (α–ε)	383(15 ?)	451(12 ?)
Words not elsewhere in New Testament (α–ε) . .	20(1 ?)	74(5 ?)
Words not elsewhere in the Greek Bible (α–ω) .	9(1 ?)	21(5 ?)

The last comparison is of sufficient interest to justify giving the lists in full.

Peculiar to Mark and Luke in the Greek Bible

ἀρχισυνάγωγος	
ἀνάγαιον	Mark 14, 15 = Luke 22, 12.
βλητέον	Mark 2, 22 (*v. l.*) = Luke 5, 38.
ἐκπνεῖν	Mark 15, 37, 39 = Luke 23, 46.
ἱματίζειν	Mark 5, 15 = Luke 8, 35.
λεπτόν	Mark 12, 42 = Luke 21, 2; also Luke 12, 59.
πρύμνα	
συνζητεῖν	
συσπαράσσειν	Mark 9, 20 = Luke 9, 42.

It will be noted that more than half of the cases are in parallel passages.

Peculiar to Second Maccabees and Luke in the Greek Bible

ἀγωνία	Luke 22, 44 (*v. l.*).	εὔθυμος	
ἀνάπηρος	also Tobit 14, 2 (*v. l.*).	ἱερόσυλος	
ἀντιβάλλειν		μετρίως	
ἀσκεῖν		περιρηγνύναι	
ἄτερ		πρεσβεία	
αὐστηρός		προσκλίνειν	
διανύειν		συνελαύνειν	Acts 7, 26 (*v. l.*).
εἰστρέχειν		σύντροφος	also *v. l.* in 1 Macc. 1, 6; 3 Reg. 12, 24.
ἐκπλήρωσις		συντυγχάνειν	
ἐπιτροπή		ὑποζωννύναι	
ἔσθησις	3 Macc. 1, 16 (*v. l.*).		

Vogel gives a list of more than fifty words and expressions peculiar to Luke in the New Testament and found in 2 Maccabees but not in the canonical books of the Old Testament. But many of these are found in the other apocryphal books and are therefore omitted from the foregoing list. On the other hand Vogel overlooks some of

the words cited here. Further coincidences between Luke and 2 Maccabees in the use of words will be found in the word lists below under ἀναλύω, ἀνατίθημι, διανοίγω, διερμηνεύω, ἐπανάγω, ἐπίστασις.[1]

In view of the dangers that have attended the study of Luke's vocabulary in the past it may well be asked whether any examination of it can be safely made. Probably it can be done if the method of procedure is selected with some care, and if the results are not treated too mathematically or made to prove too much. The following methods were adopted only after due consideration and testing, and both the results and the methods by which they are reached are submitted here only tentatively and as the means of a rough estimate of the character of Luke's vocabulary.

The natural way to compare the vocabularies of two authors seemed to be to confine attention in each author to words of unusual occurrence in Greek literature, or at least to those not found in all grades of Greek prose, and to classify these in accordance with the class or age of Greek writing to which they seem to belong; then by counting the number of words of each class used by each author to discover which of the two writers inclined in his distinctive vocabulary towards the educated, Attic, and older words, which towards the more vulgar, less classical, and later words.

Such a comparison involves the analysis of two vocabularies, for example in our case, the vocabulary of Luke and that of at least one other Hellenistic author. Unfortunately most of the numerous linguistic studies in Hellenistic literature deal only with grammar. For Polybius, Strabo, Diodorus Siculus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Plutarch we possess no thorough or well-sifted analysis of vocabulary, as Schmid has already noted with regret.[2] The same is true of the two most extensive Jewish writers, Josephus and Philo, for neither of whom even a lexicon is available. The vocabularies of Jewish and Christian writings, whether canonical or apocryphal, are either unclassified or have been studied in groups that include several different authors. A noteworthy exception is Nägeli, *Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus*.[3] The most thorough and satis-

[1] See also W. K. L. Clarke, "Acts and the LXX" in *Christian Origins* (to be published shortly).

[2] Schmid, *Der Atticismus*, IV, 634.

[3] Göttingen, 1905. The study includes only the rarest words, and continues down the alphabet part way through the letter ε.

factory work of the kind desired was found to be the analyses of vocabulary in Schmid's *Atticismus*[1] for Dio Chrysostom, Lucian, Aristides, Aelian, and the younger Philostratus. That a comparison of the New Testament language with the later Greek has been greatly facilitated by this elaborate work was recognized several years ago by Professor J. H. Thayer,[2] but apparently it has never been methodically used for this purpose.

The method of Schmid is as follows:[3]

Words that are of frequent occurrence in the Attic and the better literature of all periods are altogether omitted from consideration as being of no value for estimating "stilistische Neigungen" of the writer. Of the remaining words Schmid makes five classes according to their occurrence in extant authors:

A. Common Attic words, or words occurring in several Attic writers.
B. Words found only or principally in one prose writer before Aristotle.
C. Words found in poetry but not in Attic prose.
D. Words belonging to the post-classical prose, including Aristotle.
E. Words found first in the author under investigation.

In the lists which follow the same classification has been made of the vocabulary of Luke and Acts, extending down the alphabet through the letter ε. As about three-fourths of Luke's vocabulary occurs in the writings of the five authors treated by Schmid, we can follow his authority for nearly all the words which are to be omitted altogether from classification and for a great many of the words that fall into the first four classes. Where Schmid's estimate of a word is obtainable the reference to his work is given. The other words are classified as much in accordance with his methods as possible. As the date of Luke's work is uncertain it seemed safest to include in the last class only words in Luke and Acts that are found in no other writer before 200 A.D., which is about the lower limit for

[1] *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus* (4 vols. and index, 1887–1897).

[2] Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, III, 43 ("Language of the New Testament").

[3] *Op. cit.* I, 103 n., 400.

the Atticists treated by Schmid. But of course it is quite possible that the words in list D marked only Josephus or Plutarch are also, strictly speaking, words first used by Luke. The enumeration does not aim to be complete except in the case of the Septuagint [1] (as represented by the texts underlying Hatch and Redpath's Concordance) and the New Testament.[2] In addition, words found in the papyri (except those found only in Christian papyri or papyri of the Byzantine period) are marked by the simple abbreviation, "Pap." In view of the promised lexicon to the papyri it did not seem worth while in most cases to give the references for the occurrence of these words.[3]

WORD LISTS

A. Common Attic Words or Words Occurring in Several Attic Writers [4]

† ἄγνωστος — 'unknown.' Schmid IV, 118. — Hom., Pind., Thuc., Plat., LXX (Wisd., 2 Macc.), Joseph., Pap., Inscr.

† ἀγοραῖος — Schmid I, 251. — Ar., Arist. *et al.*, Joseph., Strab., Luc., Inscr., Pap.

ἀγρυπνέω — Schmid IV, 118. — Plat., Xen., Theognis, LXX, Mk. *al.*, Luc., Philostr., Inscr., Pap.

† [ἀηδία] — Schmid II, 72. — Plat., Oratt., Hipp., Arr., Pap. (See Moulton and Milligan, *Vocabulary s. v.*, who call it a vernacular word.)

[1] The symbol LXX is used for the Greek Old Testament, but if a word occurs only in the Apocrypha that fact is shown by adding in parenthesis the exact reference or "Apocr."

[2] The obelus (†) is used to mark words occurring in the New Testament only in Luke or Acts, but is enclosed in round brackets if it occurs in another New Testament writing as a variant reading. Words enclosed in square brackets are variant readings in Luke or Acts.

[3] For a list of the principal collections, see Moulton, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, I, index; Moulton and Milligan, *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament.*

[4] The customary abbreviations are employed. Note that "Ar." stands for Aristophanes, "Arist." for Aristotle. Abbreviations for the Gospels (in these lists) Mt., Mk., Jn. When the word occurs in Luke only in a context derived from Mark or Q, or in quotation or reminiscence from the Old Testament, the source is noted in brackets at the end of the entry, *e. g.* — [Q]

αἰγιαλός — Schmid IV, 120. — Att. poetry and prose, LXX, Mt., Jn., Luc., Philostr., Pap. ("common," Moulton and Milligan).

† αἰτέω — with inf. but not acc. of person. Schmid III, 98 ("bewusster Atticismus"). — Trag., Plat., Ar., Isocr.

† αἴτιον — = αἰτία. Dem., Plat., Joseph., Pap.

ἀκοή — = οὖς. Schmid I, 104 ("diesen Sinn scheint das Wort im N.T. nicht zu haben"; but cf. Luke 7, 1, Mark 7, 35, Acts 17, 20, Heb. 5, 11). — LXX (2 Macc. 15, 39) *al.*

ἄλευρον — Schmid IV, 122. — Hdt., Att. prose., LXX, Joseph., Mt., Luc., Philostr., Pap. — [Q]

† ἀλλόφυλος — Thuc., Plat., Hipp., Aesch., Com., Polyb., Diod., LXX, Joseph., Philo, Pap.

† ἀμάρτυρος — Schmid IV, 123. — Thuc., Dem., Callim., Joseph., Luc., Plut., Hdn., Pap.

ἄμεμπτος — Schmid I, 208; II, 75. — Trag., Plat., Xen., Dem., LXX, Paul, Heb., Aristides, Pap.

† ἀμπελουργός — Schmid IV, 123. — Ar., Alex., Amphis, Luc., Plut., Philostr., LXX, Inscr., Pap.

ἀναβλέπω — Schmid IV, 126. — Plat., Xen., LXX, Mk., Philostr.

† ἀναβολή — Schmidt IV, 126. — Att., Dion. Hal., Joseph., LXX, Arr., Plut., Philostr., Pap.

† ἀνάγω — 'vow to gods.' Schmid II, 76. — Ionic and older Attic, Aristides, Inscr.

† ἀναζητέω — Schmid III, 100 f. — Hdt., Thuc., Ar., Xen., Dem., Plat., Polyb., LXX, Joseph., Luc., Ael., Babr., Pap.

† ἀνακαθίζω — intransitive. Xen., Plut., Hipp., Galen, Pap. (OP. 939, iv A. D., a Christian letter).

ἀνακρίνω — in forensic sense. Att. (Thayer, *s. v.*), Paul (Nägeli, p. 22), LXX (Susanna), Inscr.

† ἀνάκρισις — Xen., Plat., Oratt., LXX (3 Macc. 7, 5), Inscr., Pap.

ἀνακύπτω — Schmid IV, 126. — Hdt., Plat., Ar., Xen., LXX, Joseph., Aristeas, [John 8, 7 10], Luc., Pap.

† ἀναπείθω — Schmid I, 253 *al.* — Hdt., Thuc., Plat., Xen., *al.*, LXX, Joseph., Arr., Luc., Ael., Philostr., Plut., Pap.

† ἀνάπηρος — Schmid III, 101. — Att. prose, Joseph., Ael., LXX (2 Macc. 8, 24).

ἀνασείω — Schmid IV, 128. — Hymn. Hom., Att. prose, Eur., Ar., Diod., Dion. Hal., Mk., Philostr., Plut., Inscr., Pap.

† ἀνασκευάζω — Thuc., Xen., Polyb., Joseph., Plut., Pap. (OP. 745 i A. D., the nearest parallel to Acts 15, 24).

† ἀνασπάω — Schmid IV, 128. — Att. prose, LXX, Joseph., Luc., Philostr., Alciphr., Pap.

† ἀναφαίνομαι — Schmid IV, 272. — Att. prose, LXX, Joseph.

ἄνεσις — Schmid I, 253; IV, 128. — Thuc., Plat., Arist., Polyb., Theophr., LXX, Aristeas, Paul, Inscr., Pap.

† ἀνευρίσκω — Hdt., Plat., Xen., Trag., LXX (4 Macc. 3, 14), Joseph., Arr., Plut., Inscr.

ἀνέχομαι — with genitive. Schmid II, 77. — Plat., Eur., Mt., Mk., LXX, Arr.

† ἀνοικοδομέω — Thuc., Xen., Diod., Joseph., LXX, Plut., Hdn., Inscr., Pap. — [LXX]

ἄνομος — Att. prose and poetry, LXX, Paul (see Nägeli, p. 14) *al.*, Pap.

ἄνωθεν — temporal. Schmid III, 102; IV, 131. — Dem. *al.*, LXX, N. T., Joseph., Pap.

† ἀξιόω — 'ask,' with infin. Hdt., Oratt. *al.* (cf. Blass, N. T. Gramm., p. 226), LXX, Pap.

[ἀπαντάω] — with personal subject. Schmid II, 80; III, 102. — Att., LXX, Mk. 14, 13, Pap.

ἀπαρνέομαι — Plat., Hdt., Thuc., Hipp., Trag., LXX, Mt., Mk., Arr., Plut.

ἀπειθής — Pind., Thuc., Xen., LXX, Philo, Paul, Past. Epp., Inscr., Athen.

ἀποβαίνω — 'turn out.' Schmid II, 80. — Hdt., Thuc., Plat., Isocr., LXX, Phil. 1, 19, Pap. (PP. III, 42 H).

ἀποβολή — Plat., Arist., Rom. 11, 15, M. Anton., Arr., Plut.

† ἀποστρέφω — intrans. Hdt., Xen., Thuc., LXX (Ecclus. 8, 6 *al.*), Plut.

ἀποχωρίζω — Plat., Lys., LXX., Diod., Rev. 6, 14.

ἅρπαξ — Schmid I, 256. — Ar., Xen., LXX, Mt., Paul.

ἀρχηγός — Thuc., Plat., Isocr., Aesch., Arist., Polyb., Diod., LXX, Heb., Hdn., Inscr., Pap.

† ἀσιτία — Eur., Hdt., Hipp., Arist., Joseph., Plut., Galen.

† ἀσμένως — Schmid II, 87; IV, 138. — Plat., Dem., Polyb., Diod., Dion. Hal., LXX, Joseph., Aristides, Alciphr., Pap.

ἀσπασμός — Theognis, Plat., LXX, Aristeas, Mt., Mk., Paul, Arr., Pap. (OP. 471, 67, ii A. D.)

ἀτιμάζω — Schmid II, 88. — Poets and Attic prose., LXX, Mk. *v. l.*, Jas., Paul, Jn., Dio Chrys., Luc., Aristides, Pap.

ἄτοπος — Schmid IV, 139. — Plat. *et al.*, LXX, 2 Thess. 3, 2, Luc., Philostr., Pap.

αὐλίζομαι — Schmid IV, 139. — Hom., Hdt., Att., LXX, Mt. 21, 17, Arr., Luc., Philostr., Inscr.

† αὐστηρός — of men. Plat., Polyb., Dion. Hal., LXX (2 Macc. 14, 30), Plut., Diog. Laert., Pap.

αὐτόματος — Schmid IV, 140. — Hom., Hdt., Att. prose, LXX, Philo, Mk. 4, 28, Philostr., Diod., Arr., Pap.

† αὐτόπτης — Hdt., Plat., Xen., Oratt., Polyb. and later Gk. writers, Joseph., Pap.

† αὐτόχειρ — Schmid I, 112, 257; II, 90. — Att., Joseph., Arr., Dio Chrys., Luc., Aristides.

ἀφανίζω — Schmid I, 112; II, 90; III, 106. — Thuc., Plat., Ar., LXX, Mt., Jas., Pap. — [LXX]

[ἀφορμή] — Schmid IV, 141 f. — Att. prose, Polyb., LXX, Paul (see Nägeli, p. 15), Luc., Philostr., Pap.

ἄχυρον — Schmid IV, 142. — Hdt., Xen., Com., LXX, Mt. 3, 12, Pap. (" very common," Moulton and Milligan). — [Q]

† βαθύνω — Hom., Xen., Theophr., Dion. Hal., LXX, Joseph.

† βάσις — 'foot.' Schmid III, 107 *al.* — Plat., Arist., Joseph., Philostr., Ael., LXX (Wisd. 13, 18), Apollod.

βόθυνος	Xen., Lys., Solon, Cratin., Theophr., LXX, Mt. 12, 11; 15, 14, Galen. — [Q]
† *βολή*	(cf. Schmid IV, 282). Thuc., Xen., LXX, Joseph.
βούλημα	Schmid II, 91. — Plat., Arist., LXX (2 and 4 Macc.), Aristeas, Rom. 9, 19, Arr., Pap.
βρῶμα	Schmid IV, 143. — Hipp., Thuc., Xen., LXX, Paul *et al.*, Arr., Alciphr.
γεύομαι	metaphorically. Schmid I, 113. — Hom., Hdt., Soph., Plat. *al.*, LXX, Mt., Mk.
γνωστός	Plat., Xen., Trag. *al.*, LXX, Rom. 1, 19, Jn.
γόμος	Hdt., Dem., Aesch., Mosch. *al.*, LXX, Rev. 18, 11 f., Inscr., Pap.
δεινῶς	Schmid III, 108; IV, 147. — Att., LXX, Mt. 8, 6.
δέρω	Schmid IV, 147. — Hom., Soph., Com., Plat., Xen., LXX, Mt., Mk., Paul, Jn., Pap.
δέσμιος	Trag., Att. (Bekker, *Anecdota Graeca*, I, 90), LXX, Diod., Paul (Nägeli, p. 26) *et al.*, Pap.
† *δευτεραῖος*	Hdt., Xen., Polyb., Diod., Inscr.
† *δημηγορέω*	Schmid IV, 148. — Ar., Xen., Plat., Dem., Joseph., LXX, Alciphr.
† *διαβάλλω τινά τινι*	Schmid IV, 149. — Hdt., Thuc., Plat., Pap. (TbP. I, 23, ii B. C.), Theodotion (Dan. 3, 8).
† *διάγνωσις*	Plat., Hipp., Dem., LXX (Wisd. 3, 18), Joseph., Arr., Plut., Dio Cass., Inscr., Pap.
† *διακούω*	Schmid IV, 150. — Xen., Plat. *al.*, LXX, Joseph., Luc., Philostr., Inscr., Pap.
διαλογίζομαι	Schmid II, 93. — Att. prose, LXX, Mt., Mk., Pap.
διαμαρτύρομαι	Schmid II, 94. — Xen. and especially Dem., LXX, Paul *al.*
διαμερίζω	Schmid I, 259. — Plat., Menand., LXX, Aristeas, Mt., Mk., Jn., Luc.
† *διανόημα*	Schmid II, 94. — Xen., Plat., Arr., Aristides, LXX.

† διασείω — Schmid II, 94 *al.* — Plat., Xen., Dem., Polyb., LXX, Joseph., Luc., Aristides, Ael., Inscr., Pap.

διασπάω — Schmid IV, 151. — Hdt., Att. prose and poetry, LXX, Mk. 5, 4, Philostr., Luc.

† διατηρέω — Plat., Oratt., Com., Arist., Polyb., LXX, Aristeas, Plut., Inscr., Pap.

† διαφεύγω — Schmid IV, 152. — Hdt. *al.*, LXX, Joseph., Arr., Luc., Philostr., Pap.

† διαχλευάζω — Plat., Dem., Aeschin., Polyb., Joseph.

† διαχωρίζομαι — Schmid IV, 152. — Ar., Plat. Xen. *al.*, LXX, Diod., Joseph., Plut.

† διερωτάω — Plat., Xen., Dem., Polyb., Joseph., Plut., Dio Cass. *al.*

† διισχυρίζομαι — Oratt., Plat., Joseph., Dio Cass. *al.*

δικαίωμα — Plat., Arist., LXX, Paul (Nägeli, p. 22) *al.*, Pap.

† διόρθωμα — Hipp., Arist., Polyb., Plut., Diog. Laert., Pap.

διορύσσω — Schmid IV, 153. — Att. prose, LXX, Mt., Inscr., Pap. — [Q]

διχοτομέω — Plat., Arist., Mt. 24, 51, LXX — [Q]

δυνατοί, οἱ — 'the rich, prominent.' Schmid IV, 155. — Hdt., Att. prose, Joseph., Philostr.

δυσκόλως — Plat., Isocr., Dem., Mt. 19, 23 = Mk. 10, 23. — [Mk]

† ἐγκάθετος — Plat., Dem., Hyperides, Polyb., LXX, Joseph.

† ἔγκυος — Hdt., Hipp., Arist., Anth., Diod., LXX (Ecclus. 42, 10), Joseph., Plut., Pap.

† ἔδαφος — Schmid II, 98. — Att. prose and poetry, LXX, Aristeas, Inscr., Pap.

εἰσπορεύομαι — Xen. *et al.*, LXX, Mt., Mk., Inscr., Pap.

† εἰστρέχω — Xen., Thuc., Theocr., LXX (2 Macc. 5, 26), Joseph., Lycophron.

† ἐκβολή — Schmid I, 262. — Dem., Arist., LXX, Luc., Pap.

ἐκκόπτω — Schmid IV, 158. — Hdt. *al.*, LXX, Mt., Paul, Pap.

† ἐκκρέμαμαι — Schmid IV, 158. — Eur., Thuc., Philo, Joseph., LXX.

† ἐκλαλέω — Schmid IV, 159. — Eur., Dem., Philo, Joseph., Philostr., Dio Cass., LXX (Jud. 11, 9 *v. l.*)

ἐκλεκτός — Plat., Thuc., LXX, Enoch, Mt., Mk. *al.*, Pap.

ἐκλογή — Plat., Arist., Polyb., Diod., Dion. Hal., Joseph., Aristeas, Paul *al.*, Aquila, Symm., Theodot., Pap.

ἐκπνέω — Plat., Aesch., Eur., Soph., Arist., Mk. 15, 37 39, Philostr. — [Mk]

ἐκπορεύομαι — Schmid IV, 160. — Xen., Polyb., Aeneas Tact., LXX, Mt., Mk., Paul, Rev.

† ἑλκόομαι — Hipp., Xen., Eur., Com., Plut.

ἐμβλέπω — Schmid IV, 161. — Plat., Xen., Polyb., LXX, Mt., Mk., Jn., Pap.

ἐμφανίζω — Schmid II, 103. — Xen., Plat., Dem., Aeschin., LXX, Mk., Jn., Heb., Inscr., Pap.

† ἔνεος — Schmid III, 120. — Plat., Arist., LXX, Joseph.

† ἐντόπιος — Plat., Soph.,[1] Dion. Hal., Hdn., Inscr., Pap.

ἐνυπνιάζω — Hipp., Arist., LXX, Jude 8, Plut. — [LXX]

ἐξαίφνης — Hom., Pind., Plat., Dem. *al.*, LXX., Mk. 13, 36, Arr., Plut., Galen., Babr., Pap.

ἐξαλείφω — Schmid IV, 163. — Att. prose and poetry, Paul, Rev., Luc., Philostr., Inscr., Pap.

† ἐξάλλομαι — Hom., Xen. *al.*, LXX, Joseph.

† ἐπάναγκες — Schmid I, 264. — Hdt., Aeschin., Plat., Dem. *al.*, Arist., Dion. Hal., Joseph., Arr., Luc., Plut. *al*, Pap.

ἐπάνω — with gen. Schmid I, 119 ("seit Hdt. in allen Schichten der Sprache verbreitet"). — LXX, Mt. *al.*, Pap.

† ἔπαυλις — Schmid III, 123. — Hdt., Plat., Diod., Polyb., Philo, Ael., Plut., LXX, Pap. — [LXX]

† ἐπειδήπερ — Plat., Thuc., Ar., Arist., Dion. Hal., Philo, Joseph.

† ἐπέκεινα — Schmid II, 108 f. — Soph., Eur., Thuc., Plat., Xen., Isocr., Strabo, Luc. *al.*, LXX. — [LXX]

† ἐπιβιβάζω — Thuc., Plat., Diod., LXX.

[1] *Oed. Col.* 841 (MSS. not editions).

ἐπιγινώσκω 'recognize.' Schmid IV, 166. — Hom., Aesch., Thuc., Plat., Xen., LXX, Mt. *al.*

† ἐπικρίνω Plat., Dem., Arist., Theophr., Dion. Hal., LXX (Apocr.), Joseph., Plut., Hdn. *al.*, Pap.

† ἐπινεύω Schmid IV, 167. — Hom. and other poets, Att. prose, LXX, Aristeas, Joseph., Luc. *al.*, Pap.

† ἐπίνοια Schmid II, 109 *al.* — Soph., Ar., Thuc., Xen., Plat., LXX, Joseph., Aristeas, Arr., Luc. *al.*, Pap.

† ἐπισίτισμος 'supplies.' Dem., Xen., LXX, Joseph., Hdn., Inscr.

† ἐπιστρέφω transitive. Schmid IV, 169. — Xen. *al.*, LXX.

† ἐπιτροπή Dem., Hipp., Thuc., Polyb., Dion. Hal., Diod., LXX (2 Macc. 13, 14), Joseph., Aquila, Pap.

† [ἐπιφανής] 'illustrious.' Schmid IV, 169. — Att. prose, LXX, Philostr., Pap. — [LXX]

ἐρημόω Hdt., Thuc., Plat., Xen., Andocid., poets, LXX, Philo, Mt. 12, 25, Rev., Pap. — [Q]

εὐαγγελίζομαι Schmid IV, 173. — Ar., Dem., Lycurg., Theophr., LXX, Joseph., Paul *al.*, Luc., Plut., Paus.

† [εὖγε] Schmid IV, 173. — Ar., Plat., LXX, Philostr.

† εὔθυμος Plat., Xen., Att. poets, LXX (2 Macc. 11, 26), Joseph., Plut., Pap.

† εὐθύμως Xen., poetry, Polyb., Joseph., Plut.

εὐκαιρία Schmid III, 126. — Plat., Isocr. *al.*, Mt. 16, 26 (the parallel passage), Pap.

εὐλογέω 'praise.' Schmid I, 267. — Ar., Att., Polyb., Aristeas, Luc.

† εὐπορία Thuc., Plat., Xen., Oratt., LXX (4 Reg. 25, 10 A), Philo, Joseph., Arr., Plut., Aquila, Pap.

† εὐτόνως cf. Schmid I, 267. — Ar., Xen., Menand., Diod., LXX, Joseph., Pap. (TbP. 678, medical; Petr. P.)

ἐχθές Schmid IV, 176; Lobeck, *Phryn.* 323. — LXX, Jn. 4, 52; Heb. 13, 8, Pap. — [LXX]

B. Words from the Vocabulary of Individual Writers before Aristotle

1. *From Plato*

ἀνάγνωσις	'reading.' Schmid I, 299. — Plat., LXX, Aristeas, Paul *al.*, Arr., Luc., Pap.
† *ἀνάλημψις*	Schmid I, 299. — Plat., Hipp., Polyb., Luc., Com., Pap.
ἀπολύτρωσις	Plat., Polyb., LXX, Aristeas, Philo, Joseph., Diod., Paul (Nägeli, p. 30), Heb., Plut.
ἄφεσις	'forgiveness.' Plat., Diod., Dion. Hal., Philo, Enoch, Paul (Nägeli, p. 55) *al.*, Pap.
βαπτίζω	Schmid I, 299. — Plat., Polyb., Diod., Strabo, LXX, Mt., Mk., Jn., Paul, Arr., Plut., Luc., Pap.
γεννητός	Schmid I, 299. — Plat., Diod., LXX., Mt. 11, 11, Luc. — [Q]
† *διαμερισμός*	Plat., Diod., LXX, Joseph.
διανοίγω	Schmid I, 300. — Plat., Arist., LXX, Mk., Luc., Plut.
† *διαπραγματεύομαι*	Plat., Dion. Hal.
† *ἐπισφαλής*	'dangerous.' Schmid I, 300. — Hipp., Plat., Polyb., LXX (Wisd. 9, 14), Joseph., Aristeas, Luc., Pap. (?)

2. *From Xenophon*

† *ἀντικαλέω*	Xen.
† *βλέπω*	in geographical sense (*specto*). Xen., LXX (Ezek. 11, 1 *al.*), Diog. Laert., Hdn., Pap.
ἑκατονταπλασίων	Xen., LXX, Mk. 10, 13. — [Mk]
† *ἐπανάγω*	'put to sea.' Xen., LXX (2 Macc. 12, 4), Pap.
† [*ἑσπερινός*]	Xen., LXX, Dio Cass., Athen., Pap.

3. *From Herodotus*

ἀθέμιτος — Hdt., Dion. Hal., LXX (2 and 3 Macc.), 1 Pet. 4, 3, Plut., Vett. Val., Pap.

† ἀναβαθμός — Schmid III, 171. — Hdt., Ael., LXX, Dio Cass., Inscr. (*αναβαζμους* Syll. 587, 308, iv B.C.)

4. *From Hippocrates*

† ἀνάψυξις — Hipp., LXX, Philo, Strabo, Galen, Eccles.

† ἀνωτερικός — Hipp., Galen, Epiphan.

† ἐκδιηγέομαι — Hipp., Arist., LXX, Philo, Joseph., Galen.

† ἐκψύχω — Hipp., Herond., Aretaeus, Galen, LXX, Plut., Babr., Iambl.

† [ἐνισχύω] — transitive. Hipp., LXX.

5. *From Thucydides*

† ἀγωνίζομαι — with infinitive. Schmid IV, 256, 389. — Thuc., Diod., Plut., Philostr.

6. *From Demosthenes*

† ἀσώτως — Dem., Joseph., Polyaen., Dio Cass., Athen.

† δανιστής — Schmid I, 309. — Dem., LXX, Joseph., Plut., Luc., Pap.

7. *From Isocrates*

† ἐκταράσσω — Schmid I, 311. — Isocr., LXX, Plut., Joseph., Dio Cass., Luc., Alciphr.

8. *From Hyperides*

† ἀνέκλειπτος — Hyperides, Diod., Aristeas, Plut., Sext. Emp., Inscr., Pap.

C. Poetic Expressions

ἀγέλη — Schmid II, 187. — Hom., Trag., Pind., Plat., Xen., Mt., Mk., LXX, Luc. *al.*, Pap. — [Mk]

† ἀγκαλή — Schmid I, 318 *al.* — Hdt., Eur., Plat., Joseph., LXX, Luc., Philostr., Pap.

ἁγνίζω	Soph., Eur., Diphil., Apoll. Rhod., Diod., LXX, Jn. *al.*, Plut., Pap.
αἷμα	'murder.' Schmid IV, 268. — Trag., LXX, Rev. *al.*
αἰνέω	("poetic and Ionic," Liddell and Scott) — Plat., LXX, Rev., Plut., Inscr. (Syll. 835, 8, iv B.C.)
(†) αἶνος	("Greek poets," Thayer). — LXX, Mt. 21, 16 (LXX), Inscr.
ἀλέκτωρ	Schmid I, 319. — Poets, LXX, Mt., Mk., Jn., Pap. — [Mk.]
ἀλήθω	Theophr., Com., Anth., Diod., LXX, Mt. 24, 41 (from Q), Pap. — [Q]
ἀμνός	Ar., Soph., LXX, Jn., Pap. — [LXX]
ἀναβλέπω	'see again.' Schmid IV, 270. — Eur., Hdt., Plat., Ar., Mt., Mk., Jn., Paus., Inscr., LXX.
† ἀναδείκνυμι	Schmid IV, 271 *al.* — Soph., Hdt., Xen., Polyb., LXX, Joseph., Luc., Philostr., Inscr.
ἀνακράζω	Schmid I, 320. — Hom., Com., Xen., Polyb., LXX, Mk., Luc., Philostr., Pap. (B G U IV, 1201, 11, ii A.D.)
† ἀναφαίνω	active.[1] Schmid IV, 273. — Hom., Aesch., Eur., Plat.
ἄνυδρος	Schmid IV, 275. — Hdt., Eur., Theophr., LXX, Mt. 12, 43 *al.*, Pap. — [Q]
ἀπόκρυφος	Eur., Callim., Xen., Anth., LXX, Mk. 4, 22, Col. 2, 3, Vett. Val., Pap. (Jewish magic). — [Mk]
† ἀπομάσσομαι	Schmid IV, 276 *al.* — Com., Dem., Polyb., Theocr., LXX (Tob. 7, 17, *v. l.*), Luc.
† ἀποτινάσσω	cf. Schmid I, 348. — Eur., LXX, Galen.
† ἀποψύχω	Schmid I, 149 *al.* — Ar., Bion, Hipp., LXX (4 Macc. 15, 18), Joseph., Arr., Dio Chrys. *al.*, Pap.
† ἀργυρόκοπος	Phryn. (Com.), LXX, Plut., Inscr. (CI 3154), Pap.
† ἀρήν	Hom., Com., Inscr., LXX, Joseph., Pap.

[1] Schmid indicates that this word is absent from the New Testament, evidently an oversight.

ἀρτύω [1]	Schmid II, 190. — Hom. and the other poets, Arist., Theophr., Polyb., LXX, Mk. *al.*, Pap. — [Mk]
ἀσάλευτος	Schmid I, 149. — Eur., LXX, Anth., Diod., Heb. 12, 28, Dio Chrys., Plut., Polemon, [Plat.] *Axioch.* 370D, Inscr.
ἄσβεστος	Schmid I, 322. — Poets, Dion. Hal., LXX (Job. 20, 26 *v. l.*), Philo, Mt. 3, 12, Mk., Strabo, Luc., Ael., Plut. — [Q]
† ἄσημος	metaphorically. Schmid I, 322. — Eur. and other poets, Hdt., LXX (3 Macc. 1, 3), Joseph., Dion. Hal. *al.*
† ἀστράπτω	Schmid IV, 278. — Trag., Ar., late epic, Plat., Xen., LXX, Philostr., Pap. (magic).
† ἄτερ	Poets and late prose, LXX (2 Macc. 12, 15), Plut., Inscr., Pap.
† αὐγή	Schmid IV, 279 *al.* — Poets, Plat., Xen., LXX, Joseph.
† ἄφαντος	Schmid II, 191. — Hom., Pind., Soph., Diod., Aristides, Plut.
† ἄφνω	Schmid III, 186. — mostly poetical; Thuc., Dem., LXX, Joseph., Ael., Arr.
† ἀχλύς	Schmid I, 323 *al.* — Epic, Polyb., Arist., Aquila, Symm., Joseph., Luc., Philostr.
βαρέω	Schmid I, 322. — Hom., Plat., Theocr., Paul (Nägeli, p. 26), Luc., Ael., Plut., Pap.
βαστάζω	Schmid I, 323. — Trag., Com., Polyb., LXX (rare), Mt., Mk., Paul, Rev., Arr., Luc., Pap.
βάτος	Schmid I, 323. — Hom., Theophr., Ar., Luc., Philostr., LXX, Mk.
βλέπω	Schmid IV, 281. — chiefly poetical, and then in late prose; LXX, Mt., Paul *al.*, Pap.
† βουνός	Com., Polyb., LXX, Philo, Joseph., Strabo, Plut., Paus., Inscr., Pap. — [LXX]

[1] Schmid indicates that this word is absent from the New Testament, evidently an oversight.

(†) *βραχίων* — Hom., Eur., Arist., LXX, Joseph., Jn. 12, 38 (from LXX.), Pap.

βρέφος — Hom., Pind., Anth., LXX (Apocr.), 2 Tim. 3, 15 *al*, Pap.

βρέχω — Schmid II, 192. — originally poetical; Polyb., Mt. *al.*, LXX., Arr., Aristides, Pap.

βρυγμός — Eupolis, Ephipp. (?), LXX, Mt., Galen, Eccles. — [Q]

† *βρύχω* or *βρύκω* — Hom., Hermipp., Hipp., LXX.

† *βρώσιμος* — Aesch., Diphilus (Bekker, *Anecd.* I, 84), LXX.

γέν(ν)ημα — Schmid II, 293. — Soph., Plat., LXX, Mt., Pap. — [Q]

† *γλεῦκος* — Schmid I, 324. — Nicand., Arist., LXX, Joseph., Luc., Plut., Pap.

γογγυσμός — Anaxandrides, LXX, Paul (Nägeli, pp. 26 f.) *al.*, M. Anton.

δαιμονίζομαι — 'be possessed.' Philemon, Mt. *al.*, Aquila, Plut., Pap. (PLeid. W vi. 30, Jewish).

δεσμεύω — Schmid III, 190. — Hymn. Hom., Hes., Eur., Plat., Xen., Polyb., LXX, Mt. 23, 4, Arr., Pap.

† *διαλαλέω* — Schmid IV, 285. — Eur., Polyb., Symm., Joseph., Philostr., Alciphr.

† *διαλεκτός* — 'language.' Ar., Com., Arist., Polyb., Diod., LXX, Philo, Joseph., Plut.

† *διανεύω* — Schmid I, 314. — Alexis, Polyb., Diod., LXX, Luc.

† *διανύω* — Schmid I, 325 *al.* — Hom., Eur., Xen., Polyb., LXX (2 Macc. 12, 17), Joseph., Luc. *al.*

† *διοπετής* — (cf. Schmid I, 325) — Eur., Dion. Hal., Luc., Hdn., Aristopho, Plut.

διωγμός — Aesch., Soph., Xen., LXX, Mt., Mk., Paul (Nägeli, p. 26) *al.*, Plut.

† *δοχή* — 'reception.' Machon, LXX, Plut. ('receptacle,' Hipp.; 'receipt,' Pap.)

δῶμα — Schmid III, 193. — "Poetic and Alexandrian prose." LXX, Mt., Mk., Ael., Pap.

† ἔα — Aesch., Soph., Ar., Plat., LXX.[1]

εἰσακούω — Hom., Soph., Eur., Hdt., Arist., LXX, Mt. *al.*, Pap.

† ἔκθετος — Eur., Manetho, Vett. Val.

† ἐκκολυμβάω — Eur., Ar., Diod., Dion. Hal.

† ἐκτελέω — Schmid II, 195. — Hom., Hes., Pind., Soph., Eur., Plat., LXX, Joseph., Luc., Aristides, Pap.

ἐκτενῶς — Machon, Diod., LXX, 1 Pet. 1, 22, M. Anton., Polyb., Inscr.

ἐκτινάσσω — Trag., Pind., Hipp., Mt. 10, 14 = Mk. 6, 11, Plut., LXX, Pap.

ἐμπαίζω — Schmid I, 327. — Soph., Eur., Anth., LXX, Mt., Mk., Arr., Luc.

† ἐννεύω — Schmid I, 314. — Ar., LXX, Luc.

ἐντυλίσσω — Ar., Com. frag., Mt. 27, 59, Jn. 20, 7 (the parallel passages), Arr., Athen., Ev. Nicod., Pap. (BM I, p. 110, 826, iii A.D.).

ἑξαυτῆς — Theognis, Arat., Polyb., Joseph., Mk. 6, 25; Phil. 2, 23, Opp., Pap.

ἐπαινέω — Schmid III, 197; IV, 294. — Hom. *al.*, LXX, Paul, Luc., Aristides, Philostr., Alciphr., Pap.

† ἐπαιτέω — Schmid I, 328. — Hom., Soph., LXX, Joseph., Pap.

† ἐπακροάομαι — Schmid I, 314 *al.*[2] — Plato Comicus, Test. XII Patr., Luc., Philostr.

† ἐπεγείρω — Schmid II, 196. — Hom., Soph., Eur., Plat., LXX, Joseph., Luc., Aristides, M. Anton.

† ἐπέρχομαι, — with dative. Schmid IV, 295. — chiefly poetical, LXX, Pap.

ἐπίβλημα — Nicostratus, LXX, Mt. 9, 16 = Mk. 2, 21, Arr., Plut. — [Mk]

ἐπίκειμαι — 'press upon.' Schmid I, 329. — Hom., Eur., Hdt., Ar., Theocr., Paus., LXX, Joseph.

† ἐπικέλλω — Hom., Apoll. Rhod., Numen.

[1] From Mk. 1, 24 if the reading is accepted there.

[2] Schmid assigns this word to the LXX by mistake.

(†) ἐπιρρίπτω — Schmid I, 329. — Hom., Arist., Polyb., LXX, Joseph., 1 Pet. 5, 7 (LXX), Luc., Plut., Pap.

ἐπισκιάζω — Schmid I, 329. — Hdt., Soph., Arist., Theophr., LXX, Philo, Mt. 17, 5 = Mk. 9, 7, Luc.

† ἐπιστάτης = διδάσκαλος — Antiphon (Bekker, *Anecd.* I, 96).

ἐπιφαίνω — Schmid IV, 296. — Theognis, Theocr., Dion. Hal., Plut., LXX, Tit. 2, 11; 3, 4.

ἐργάτης — Schmid I, 329. — Eur., Soph., Xen., Polyb., LXX (Apocr.), Mt., Paul *al.*, Arr., Luc., Pap.

† ἐρείδω — Schmid II, 197 *al.* — Poets, Plato, Polyb., LXX, Joseph., Aristides, Philostr., Plut.

ἔριφος or ἐρίφιον — Schmid I, 329. — Bacch., Com., LXX, Joseph., Aristeas, Mt. 25, 32 f., Luc., Pap.

ἑρπετόν — Schmid I, 330. — Hom., Ar., Pind., Eur., Callim., Theophr., LXX, Rom. 1, 23; Jas. 3, 7, Luc., Philostr.

ἑτοιμάζω — active. Schmid IV, 298. — chiefly poetic and late prose; LXX, Paul *al.*, Arr., Philostr., Pap.

εὐθυμέω — intransitive. Eur., Theocr., Anth., Symm., Jas. 5, 13, Plut., M. Anton., Pap.

† εὐσεβέω — Trag., LXX (4 Macc. 11, 5), Joseph., 1 Tim. 5, 4.

† εὐφροσύνη — Schmid I, 331. — chiefly poetical; Xen., LXX, Luc., M. Anton., Pap.

† ἐφάλλομαι — Hom., Pind. ("rare in prose," Liddell and Scott), LXX, Plut., Alciphr.

ἔχιδνα — Schmid I, 331. — Trag., Hdt., Plat., Hes., Aquila, Mt., Luc.

D. Expressions used by the Later Writers

ἄβυσσος — substantive; cf. Schmid I, 318. — LXX, Enoch, Paul (Nägeli, p. 46), Pap. (magic), Diog. Laert., Iambl. (the adj. in Aesch., Hdt., Eur., Ar., Luc.).

ἀγαθοποιέω — LXX, Mk. *al.*, Aristeas, Sext. Emp.

ἀγαλλίασις — LXX, Heb. 1, 9, Jude 24, Clem. Rom., Justin *al.*

ἀγαλλιάω	LXX, Mt. *al.*, Eccles.
ἀγαπή	LXX, Aristeas, Philo, Paul *al.*, Test. XII Patr., Pss. Sol.
ἄγγελος	'angel.' LXX, Philo, Joseph., Mt. *al.*
ἁγιάζω	LXX, Anth., Mt., Paul *al.*, Eccl.
† ἁγνισμός	Dion. Hal., LXX, Plut., Inscr.
† ἀγραυλέω	Arist., Strabo, Plut.
ἀδυνατέω	with impersonal subject; cf. Schmid III, 98 *al.* — LXX, Mt. 17, 20. — [LXX]
τὰ ἄζυμα	LXX, Mt. *al.* (the adj. in Plat., Galen, Athen.)
ἀθετέω	Schmid I, 353. — Polyb., Diod., Dion. Hal., LXX, Mk., Paul *al.*, Arr., Luc., Plut., Pap.
† αἵρεσις	'sect.' Schmid IV, 716. — Epicurus, Dion. Hal., Philo, Arr., Diog. Laert., Sext. Emp., Joseph., Plut., Strab.
αἰχμαλωτίζω	Diod., LXX, Joseph., Aristeas, Paul, Arr., Plut., Inscr. — [? LXX]
ἀκαταστασία	Polyb., Dion. Hal., LXX, Paul *al.*, Arr., Clem. Rom., Pap. (G 1, ii B.C. literary).
† ἀκροατήριον	Plut., Philo, Arr., Tatian.
ἀκροβυστία	LXX, Philo, Paul.
† ἀκωλύτως	Schmid I, 353. — Symm., Joseph., Arr., Plut., Luc., Hdn., Pap. (but in Plat.).
ἀλάβαστρον or -ος	for the earlier ἀλάβαστος. LXX, Mk. *al.*, Luc.,[1] Plut., Inscr.
† ἀλλογενής	LXX, Joseph., Inscr. (Jewish).
ἄλων	Arist., LXX, Mt. 3, 12, Babr. (?), Pap. — [Q]
ἁμαρτωλός,	substant. Arist., LXX, Paul *al.*, Plut., Inscr. (the adj. in Ar., Arist., Plut.).
ἀμήν	LXX, Mt. *al.*
† ἀνάβλεψις	Schmid III, 231. — Arist., Demetr. *de elocut.*, LXX, Ael., Eccles. — [LXX]
† ἀνάδειξις	Diod., LXX (Ecclus. 43, 6), Strabo, Plut., Eccles.
[ἀναζάω]	Rom. 7, 9, Eccles., Artemidorus, Sotion, Nilus, Inscr. (C. I. 2566), (an epic form is quoted from Nicander).

[1] Lucian, *Dial. Mer.* 14, 2, not classified by Schmid.

ἀνάθεμα	'a curse.' LXX, Paul, Anth., Plut., Inscr.
ἀναθεματίζω	LXX, Mk. 14, 71, Inscr.
ἀναθεωρέω	Schmid I, 353 *al.* — Theophr., Diod., Heb. 13, 7, Luc., Philostr., Plut.
ἀναλύω	intransitive. Schmid IV, 340. — Polyb., LXX (2 Macc. 8, 25 *al.*), Diod., Phil. 1, 23, Luc., Ael., Philostr., Pap.
† ἀναντίρ(ρ)ητος	Polyb., Joseph., Plut., Symm.
† ἀναντιρ(ρ)ήτως	Polyb., Inscr. (OGIS. 335, 138, ii B.C.), Diod., Pollux, Hesych.
ἀναπίπτω	'*accumbo*.' Schmid I, 354. — Alexis, LXX, Diod., Jn., Rev., Joseph., Luc., Pap.
ἀναστατόω	LXX, Gal. 5, 12, Justin, Pap.
ἀνατίθημι	'set forth, declare' (mid.). LXX (2 Macc. 3, 9), Gal. 2, 2, Artemidor., Plut., Pap (?).
† ἀναφωνέω	Schmid I, 354. — Arist., Polyb., LXX, Arr., Luc., Plut., Pap.
ἀνεκτός	without a preceding negative. Schmid I, 354. — "im älteren Griechisch nicht gebräuchlich." Thuc., Dem., Ar., LXX, Mt., Luc., Philostr., Inscr. — [Q]
† ἀνένδεκτος	Artemidorus, Eccles., Diog. Laert.
† ἀνετάζω	LXX (Judges 6, 29 A), Theodotion (Susanna 14), Justin, Anaphora Pilati, Pap. (OP 34, i, 13, 127 A.D.)
† ἀνεύθετος	Moschion.
† ἀνθομολογέομαι	'give thanks.' LXX, Test. XII Patr., ('agree,' Dem., Polyb., Plut., Pap.).
(†) ἀνταπόδομα	LXX, Rom. 11, 9 (LXX), Barnab., Didache.
ἀνταποκρίνομαι	Nicomachus Math., Philo, LXX, Rom. 9, 20, Schol. Pind., Schol. Hom., Justin.
† ἄντικρυς	Hellenistic equivalent for ἀντικρύ in Hom., καταντικρύ in Att. Prep., 'opposite.' Philo, Pap., LXX (3 Macc. 5, 16).
† ἀντιμετρέω	Luc.,[1] Eccles. (cf. ἀντικαταμετρέω TbP.)
† ἀντιπαρέρχομαι	Anth., LXX (Wisd. 16, 10), Galen, Eccles.

[1] Schmid does not classify. Lucian, *Amor.* 19.

† ἀντιπίπτω — Schmid II, 215. — Arist., Theophr., Polyb., LXX, Strabo., Aristides, Plut., M. Anton., Pap. (LP, D, 21, ii B.C.).

† ἀντοφθαλμέω — Polyb., Diod., LXX (Wisd. 12, 14), Clem. Rom., Barnab., Apoc. Baruch, Pap.

ἀνώτερον — adv., cf. Schmid III, 102. — Arist., Polyb., Ael., Diod., LXX, Joseph., Heb. 10, 8, Xen. Ephes., Inscr.

ἀπάντησις — Polyb., Diod., LXX., Aristeas, Mt., 1 Thess. 4, 17, Plut., Diog. Laert., Pap.

† ἀπαρτισμός — Herondas, Dion. Hal., Apollon. Dysc., Pap.

† ἀπασπάζομαι — LXX (Tob. 10, 12 ℵ), Himer.

† ἀπειλέομαι (= ἀπειλέω) — Dion. Hal., App., Polyaen., Clem. Alex. (the active in 1 Pet. 2, 23).[1]

† ἀπελπίζω — Schmid I, 156. — Epicur., Anth., Polyb., Diod., LXX, Joseph., Dio Chrys., Plut., M. Anton., Alciphr., Inscr.

ἀπέναντι — cf. Schmid II, 176. — Polyb., LXX, Mt., Inscr., Pap.

† ἀπεριτμητός — 'uncircumcised.' LXX, Philo, Joseph. (in a different sense, Plut.)

ἀποδεκατόω — LXX, Mt. 23, 23, Heb. 7, 5. — [Q]

† ἀποθλίβω — Schmid IV, 342. — Theophr., Diphil., Diod., LXX, Joseph., Luc., Philostr., Alciphr., Pap.

ἀποκάλυψις — LXX, Paul (Nägeli, p. 43) *al.*, Plut.

† ἀποκατάστασις — Arist., Epicur., Polyb., Diod., Joseph., Aristeas, Aretaeus, Plut., Galen, Inscr., Pap. (Liddell and Scott cite [Plat.] *Axioch.* 370 B.)

ἀποκεφαλίζω — LXX, Mt., Mk., Arr., Artemidorus, Dio Cass. — [Mk]

ἀποκυλίω — LXX, Mt. 28, 2 = Mk. 16, 3, Joseph., Luc.,[2] Diod. — [Mk]

ἀποστασία — Diod., Archimedes, LXX, Joseph., 2 Thess. 2, 3 (Nägeli, p. 31), Plut., Justin.

ἀποστολή — 'apostleship.' Paul, Eccles. (in other senses in Thuc., Plat., Polyb., LXX, Plut., Pap.).

[1] Thackeray, *Grammar*, I, 260 cites cases from MSS. of LXX.

[2] Schmid (I. 380) classes as first used by Lucian.

ἀποτάσσομαι — 'say farewell.' LXX, Philo, Joseph., Mk., 2 Cor. 2, 13, Aesop, Liban., Jambl., Pap.

† ἀποφορτίζομαι — Philo, Joseph., Athen., Cyril. (cf. εκφορτιζω, OP, 36, ii, 7, 9; ii–iii A. D.).

ἀπρόσκοπος — LXX (Apocr.), Paul (Nägeli, p. 43), Aristeas, Sext. Emp., Clem. Alex., Pap. (cf. απροσκοπτος, Inscr.).

ἀπωλεία — Schmid III, 233 *al.* — Arist., Polyb., LXX, Mt., Paul (Nägeli, p. 35) *al.*, Arr., Luc., Ael., Philostr., Plut., Alciphr., Diog. Laert., Pap.

ἀροτριάω — Callim., Theophr., LXX, 1 Cor. 9, 10 (Nägeli, p. 31), Dio Chrys., Luc.,[1] Babr., Pap.

† ἀρχιερατικός — Joseph., Justin, Inscr. (CIG. 4363). ('episcopal,' Eccles.)

ἀρχισυνάγωγος — Mk., Inscr. (Jewish), Pap. (gentile; see *Archiv*, II, 430).

ἀσσάριον — Anth., Dion. Hal., Plut., Mt. 10, 29, Inscr. — [Q]

† ἀσύμφωνος — 'at variance.' Schmid I, 356. — Theophr., Diod., LXX (Wisd. 18, 10), Joseph., Arr., Luc., Plut., Vett. Val. (in diff. sense, Plat.).

ἀσφαλίζω — Polyb., Diod., LXX, Joseph., Mt., Inscr., Pap.

ἀτενίζω — Schmid I, 356 *al.* — Hipp., Arist., Polyb., Diod., LXX (Apocr.), Joseph., Paul (Nägeli, p. 23), Luc., Philostr., Plut., Pap., Arist., and later writers.

αὐξάνω, — intransitive. Schmid I, 156. — Arist. and later writers, Aristeas, Mt., Paul *al.*

ἀφορίζω — 'choose, appoint.' Arist., Diod., Dio Cass., LXX, Paul (Nägeli, p. 35) *al.*, Pap. ('define,' Att.)

† ἀφυπνόω — 'fall asleep.' Hermas *al.* ('awaken,' Anth.)

βάπτισμα — Mt., Mk., Paul *al.*, Eccles.

βαπτιστής — Joseph., Mt., Mk., Justin *al.*

† βάτος, — the Hebrew measure (also spelled βαδος), LXX (2 Esd. 7, 22 A), Enoch, Joseph.

[1] *Philopatr.* Schmid does not classify, as the piece is probably not genuine. See I, 225.

βδέλυγμα	LXX, Mt. 24, 15 = Mk. 13, 14, Rev., Eccles.
βεβηλόω	LXX, Mt. 12, 5, Heliod., Pss. Sol., Hermas, Justin.
† *βίωσις*	LXX (Ecclus. Prol.). [Justin] *Quaest. ad Orth.* 124.
βιωτικός	Arist., Polyb., Diod., Philo, Paul (Nägeli, pp. 31 f.), Strabo, Arr., Plut., M. Anton., Pap.
βλασφημέω	with acc. of pers. LXX, Paul (Nägeli, p. 44), Joseph., App., Plut., M. Anton., Babr.
† *βραδυπλοέω*	Artemid. *Oneir.* 4, 30.
βυθίζω	Schmid IV, 344 f. — Arist., Polyb., LXX (2 Macc. 12, 4), 1 Tim. 6, 9 (Nägeli, p. 32), Dio Chrys., Philostr., Arr., Luc., Alciphr. (cf. Syll. 324, 7, *καταβυθίζω*).
† *βυρσεύς*	Artemid. *Oneir.*, Inscr. (CIG 3499), Pap. (FP 121, 15, *c.* 100 A.D.)
† *γάζα*	Theophr., Polyb., Diod., LXX, Plut., Inscr.
γαζοφυλάκιον	LXX, Joseph., Mk., Jn. 8, 20, Strabo, Inscr. — [Mk]
γαμίζω	Mt., Mk., Paul (Nägeli, p. 44), Apollon. *De Constr.* — [Mk. or Q]
† *γαμίσκομαι*	Arist., Callicratidas.
γέεννα	Mt., Mk., Orac. Sibyll., Justin *al.* — [Q]
† *γνώστης*	LXX, Plut.
γογγύζω	Schmid I, 357. — LXX, Mt. 20, 11, Jn., Paul, Arr., Luc., M. Anton., Pollux, Pap.
γρηγορέω	Arist., LXX, Joseph., Mt., Mk., Paul (Nägeli, p. 44) *al.*, Achil. Tat., Inscr.
† *δεισιδαιμονία*	Schmid I, 357.[1] — Theophr., Polyb., Diod., Joseph., Luc., Plut., M. Anton., Inscr.
† *δεκαοκτώ*	Schmid IV, 701. — Strabo, LXX, Inscr., Pap.
δεκαπέντε	Schmid IV, 24. — Polyb., Diod., LXX, Gal. 1, 18, Jn. 11, 18, Strabo, Plut., Inscr., Pap.
δεκτός	LXX, Paul, Alciphr., Hermas, Justin.
† *δεσμοφύλαξ*	Schmid I, 357. — Joseph., Luc., Artemid., Test. XII Patr., Pap.

[1] Schmid marks "not in New Testament," by mistake.

δηνάριον	Mt., Mk., Jn., Rev., Arr., Plut., Pap.
διαβλέπω	Schmid I, 357.[1] — Arist., Mt. 7, 5, Mk. 8, 25, Luc., Philostr., Plut., M. Anton. — [Q]
διάβολος	'devil.' Mt. *al.*, Eccles. ('adversary,' or 'slanderous,' Xen., Andocid., Eur., Arist., LXX, Past. Epp., Plut.)
† διαγογγύζω	LXX, Clem. Alex., Heliod.
† διαγρηγορέω	Hdn., Nilus.
διαθήκη	'covenant.' LXX, Mt., Paul *al.*, also once in Ar. (*Birds* 439). ('testament,' Att., Paul, Heb., Pap.)
διακρίνομαι	'doubt.' Mt. 21, 21 = Mk. 11, 23, Jas. 1, 6.
διαλογισμός	'thought.' Dion. Hal., LXX, Paul (Nägeli, p. 32) *al.*, Plut.
† διανοίγω	'explain.' Dion. Hal., Themist. Cf. LXX (2 Macc. 1, 4).
† διαπονέομαι	'be troubled.' LXX, Joseph., Aquila, Hesych., Pap.
διασκορπίζω	Schmid III, 236. — Polyb., LXX, Joseph., Mt. *al.*, Ael. (cf. διασκορπισμος, TbP 24, 55).
διαστέλλομαι	'command.' Arist., LXX, Mk., Pap., (active, 'define,' Schmid I, 300; Plat. Polyb., Luc., Diod., Strabo, Plut., Pap.).
διαταγή	LXX (2 Esd. 4, 11), Philo, Rom. 13, 2, Clem. Rom., Justin, Inscr., Pap.
† διαχειρίζομαι	'slay.' Polyb., Diod., Dion. Hal., Joseph., Plut., Hdn. (active, 'manage,' Schmid I, 115 *al.*; Att., Pap.)
διεγείρω	Schmid III, 236. — Hipp., Arist., Anth., LXX, Joseph., Mk. 4, 39, Jn. *al.*, Arr., Ael., Plut., Hdn. *al.*, Pap. (magic). — [Mk]
διερμηνεύω	'translate.' Polyb., LXX (2 Macc. 1, 36), Aristeas. 'explain,' Philo, Paul (Nägeli, p. 32).
† διετία	Philo, Inscr., Pap.
† διθάλασσος	Dio Chrys.,[2] Clem. Hom. (in a different sense, Strabo, Dion. Perieg.)

[1] Cf. Schmid, IV, 345: "vor Arist. hat das Wort, aber in anderem Sinn, nur Plat. *Phaed.* 86 D." [2] Schmid fails to classify.

† διοδεύω — Schmid I, 358. — Arist., Polyb., LXX, Joseph., Anth., Arr., Luc., Plut., Inscr., Pap.

δόμα [1] — LXX, Aristeas, Jos., Paul, Mt. 7, 11, Plut. — [Q]

δόξα — 'glory.' LXX, N. T., Eccles.

δοξάζω — 'clothe with splendor.' Polyb., LXX, Paul *al.*

(†) δυσβάστακτος [2] — LXX, Philo, Plut., Cyril., John Chrys.

† δωδεκάφυλον — Clem. Rom., Prot. Jac. (the adj. in Orac. Sibyll. ii, 171 *v. l.*).

ἐγγίζω — intransitive. Schmid I, 158. — Arist., Polyb., Diod., LXX, Paul (Nägeli, p. 36) *al.*, Arr., Dio Chrys., Pap.

ἐγκακέω — Polyb., Symm., Philo, Paul (Nägeli, p. 32), [Clem. Rom.], Euseb., Pap. (BU 1043, iii A.D.).

ἐγκόπτω — 'hinder.' Polyb., Paul, 1 Pet. 3, 7. (in other senses, Hipp., Theophr.).

† ἐδαφίζω — 'raze.' LXX, Eccles. ('pave,' Arist., Polyb.). — [LXX]

τὰ ἔθνη — 'Gentiles.' LXX, Paul (Nägeli, p. 46) *al.* (for a similar use in profane writers, see Schmid II, 217, and cf. CIA, II, 445 ff).

εἰδωλόθυτος — LXX (4 Macc. 5, 2), Paul, Rev., Didache *al.*

ἐκδικέω — Apollod., Diod., Paul, Rev., Athen., LXX, Plut., Inscr., Pap.

ἐκδίκησις — Polyb., LXX, Test. XII Patr., Paul (Nägeli, p. 33) *al.*, Inscr.

ἐκζητέω — Schmid II, 217 *al.* — LXX, Aristeas, Heb. *al.*, Aristides, Ael.

† ἔκθαμβος — Polyb., Theodot., Symm., Hermas *al.*

ἐκκλησία — 'church.' Mt., Paul *al.* (cf. LXX).

ἐκμάσσω — Schmid I, 359. — Hipp., Trag., Ar., Arist., LXX, Jn., Luc., Plut., Philostr.

† ἐκμυκτηρίζω — LXX, Evangg. Apocr.

ἐκπειράζω — LXX, Philo, Mt. 4, 7 (from Q), 1 Cor. 10, 9.

† ἐκπλήρωσις — Dion. Hal., LXX (2 Macc. 6, 14), Philo, Strabo, Dioscor., Arr.

[1] [Plat.] *Def.* 415B is not of early date. [2] Also Mt. 23, 4 according to text. rec.

ἐκριζόω	LXX, Sibyll. frag., Test. XII Patr., Mt., Jude 12, Babr.
ἔκστασις	'wonder.' LXX, Philo, Mk., Longinus, Stob.
† ἐκτένεια	Cicero, LXX (Apoc.), Joseph., Athen., Inscr. (IMA. 1032, 10).
ἐκχύννομαι	Schmid I, 359. — LXX, Mt. *al.*, Luc.
ἐλαία	for ἐλάα. Schmid I, 360 *al.* — LXX, N. T., Luc. *al.*, Pap. (also in MSS. of Xen. and Lys.).
† ἐλαιών	LXX, Joseph., Pap.
ἐλεημοσύνη	'alms,' Mt., Diog. Laert. ('mercy,' Callim., LXX).
† ἔλευσις	Dion. Hal., Clem. Rom., Polycarp, Iren., Pap.
† ἐμμαίνομαι	Joseph. *Antt.* xvii, 6, 5.
ἔμφοβος	'frightened.' Theophr., LXX (Apocr.), Rev. 11, 13. ('inspiring fear,' Schmid IV, 291; Soph., Philostr.).
† ἔναντι	LXX, Pap. (OP. 495, 5, ii A. D.), Inscr. (Syll. 300, 52, ii B.C.).
(†) ἐνδιδύσκω	LXX, Joseph., Mk. 15, 17 *v. l.*, Hermas, Inscr. (Syll. 857, 13, ii B.C.).
ἔνδυμα	LXX, Menand., Joseph., Mt., Strabo, Plut., Alciphr., Pap. (FP. 12, 20; LipsP 34). — [Q]
ἐνδυναμόω	LXX, Paul, Past. Epp., Hermas, Justin *al.*
† ἐνισχύω	intransitive. Arist., Theophr., Diod., Diosc., LXX, Joseph., Arr.
(†) ἔντρομος [1]	LXX, Plut., Anth., Justin.
ἐνώπιον	LXX, Paul, Rev. *al.*, Enoch, Inscr., Pap.
† ἐνωτίζομαι	LXX, Test. XII Patr., Eccles.
ἐξαποστέλλω	Polyb., Diod., LXX, Joseph., Paul, Apollon. Perg., Pap. (TbP 22, 18, ii B.C.)
ἐξαρτίζω	Schmid I, 361. — Joseph., 2 Tim. 3, 17, Arr., Luc., Pap.
† ἐξαστράπτω	LXX, Tryphiodorus.
ἔξοδος	'decease.' LXX (Wisd.), Philo, Joseph., 2 Pet. 1, 15, Justin *Dial.* 105.
† ἐξολεθρεύομαι	LXX, Test. XII Patr., Joseph., Plut. — [LXX]
ἐξομολογέομαι	Schmid I, 361. — LXX, Philo, Joseph.. Mt.,

[1] Occurs also in Heb. 12, 21, with *v.l.* ἔκτρομος.

Mk. 1, 5, Paul, Jas. 5, 16, Luc., Plut., Pap.

† ἐξορκιστής — Schmid I, 383.[1] — Joseph., Luc., Anth., Eccles.

ἐξουθενέω — LXX, Paul, Eccles. (cf. ἐξουδενέω, -όω Mk. 9, 12 *v. l.*, LXX).

ἐξουσιάζω — Arist., LXX, Dion. Hal., Paul, Inscr. (CIA. 4584).

† ἐξοχή — metaphorically. Cicero, Joseph., Strabo. (literal, Schmid I, 158 *al.*; Arist., Diosc., Dio Chrys., Ael., Babr., Sext. Emp., LXX).

† ἔξυπνος — LXX (1 Esd. 3, 3), Joseph., Test. XII Patr.

† ἐπαθροίζω — Plut.

ἐπαναπαύω — LXX, Rom. 2, 17, Ael.,[2] Arr., Hdn., Artemid., Barnab., Didache.

† ἐπαρχεία — Schmid I, 361. — Polyb., Diod., LXX, Joseph., Arr., Luc., Plut., Dio Chrys., Inscr., Pap.

ἐπαύριον — Polyb., LXX., Mt. 27, 62, Mk. 11, 12, Jn., Pap.

ἐπίθεσις — 'putting on.' Arist., LXX, Aristeas, Heb. 6, 2 *al.*, Plut., Inscr. ('attack,' Plat. *al.* Diod., Dion. Hal., Aristeas, Inscr., Pap. (TbP 15).

ἐπιούσιος — Mt. 6, 11. — [Q]

† ἐπιπορεύομαι — Polyb., LXX, Joseph., Plut., Pap.

ἐπισκοπή — in various senses. LXX, 1 Pet. 2, 12; 1 Tim. 3, 1, Luc.[3] (cf. επισκοπεια TbP 5, 189, 118 B.C.).

† ἐπίστασις[4] — 'attack,' LXX (2 Macc. 6, 3). ('care,' Schmid I, 362; Polyb., Diod., Luc., Pap.).

† ἐπιστηρίζω — Schmid I, 362 *al.* — Arist., LXX, Luc., Philostr.

† ἐπιστροφή — 'conversion.' LXX (Ecclus. 18, 21; 49, 2). In other senses Thuc., Joseph., LXX, Arr., Philostr., M. Anton., Pap.

ἐπισυνάγω — Polyb., LXX, Aristeas, Mt., Mk., Plut., Vett. Val., Pap. (GH 72, iii A. D.).

† ἐπισχύω — intrans. Theophr., Diod., LXX (1 Macc. 6, 6 A), (transit., Xen., Ecclus. 29, 1).

[1] Schmid classes as among the words used first or only by Lucian in List E.

[2] Schmid does not classify.

[3] *Dial. deor.* 20, 6, the only occurrence of the word noted in profane authors; but Schmid does not mention it in his word lists.

[4] The word occurs also in 2 Cor. 11, 28, possibly in this sense.

ἐπιφώσκω	LXX, Mt. 28, 1 (the parallel passage), Inscr. (CI. 9119), Pap. (BM. I p. 132, a horoscope dated 81 A. D.; GH 112, 15, Christian).
ἐρήμωσις	LXX, Mt. 24, 15 = Mk. 13, 14, Arr., Greg. Nyss. — [Mk]
† ἔσθησις	Arist., LXX (2 Macc. 3, 33), Philo, Pollux, Athen., Pap. (BU 16 R, 12, ii A.D.).
ἐσώτερος	Symm., Heb. 6, 19, Pap.
εὐαγγελίζομαι	with acc. pers. Paul *al.*, Justin, Euseb., Heliod., Alciphr.[1]
εὐαγγέλιον	'good news.' Schmid I, 363. — Menand., LXX, Mt., Mk., Paul, 1 Pet. 4, 17, Rev. 14, 6, App., Luc., Plut., Inscr.
εὐαγγελιστής	Eph. 4, 11; 2 Tim. 4, 5, Eccles.
εὐδοκέω	Polyb., Diod., Dion. Hal., LXX, N. T. (except Johannine writings), Pap.
εὐδοκία	LXX, Mt. 11, 26, Paul, Inscr. (CI. 5960).
† εὐθυδρομέω	Philo.
εὐκαιρέω	Schmid I, 363. — Polyb., Mk. 6, 31; 1 Cor. 16, 12, Diod., Plut., Luc., Cleom., Pap.
εὔκοπος	Polyb., LXX (Apocr.), Aristeas, Mt., Mk., Joseph., Anth. — [Mk, Q]
εὐλογητός	LXX, Philo, Pss. Sol., Mk. 14, 61, Paul, 1 Pet. 1, 3.
† εὐπορέομαι	Schmid I, 363. — Arist., LXX, Joseph., Luc. (the active is Attic).
εὐσχήμων	'wealthy,' 'prominent.' Mk. 15, 43, Joseph., Plut., Pap. ('comely,' Att. prose and poetry, LXX, Paul [2]).
† εὐφορέω	'be fruitful.' Schmid IV, 358. — Hipp., Joseph., Philostr., Geopon., Galen, Greg. Nyss. ('sail well,' Luc.)
εὐχαριστέω	'give thanks.' Schmid I, 159. — Polyb., Posidon., Diod., LXX, Philo, Joseph., Aristeas, Paul, Arr., Dio Chrys., Luc., Plut., Inscr., Pap.

[1] *Epist.* ii, 9 [iii, 12], 2 (codd., not in editions).

[2] 1 Cor. 7, 35; 12, 24. Schmid (II, 113) overlooks these instances in the New Testament.

εὐχαριστία	Polyb., Diod., LXX (Apocr.), Com., Philo, Paul *al.*
† *ἐφημερία*	LXX (cf. *ἐφήμερις* in Philo, Joseph., Pap.).

E. Expressions used first or only by Luke

† [*ἀγαθουργέω*]	Eccles. (cf. 1 Tim. 6, 18, *ἀγαθοεργέω*).
† *αἰτίωμα*	Pap. (FP III, 8, 95–6 A.D.)
† *ἀκατάκριτος*	
† *ἀλίσγημα*	(cf. *ἀλισγέω*, LXX).
† *ἀνατάσσομαι*	'set in order.' (in other senses, Aristeas, Dio Cass., Plut., Iren.)
† *ἀπελεγμός*	
† [*ἀποδεκατεύω*][1]	
† *ἀποστοματίζω*	'urge to speak.'
† *ἀρτέμων*[2]	
† *ἀρχιτελώνης*	
† *ἀφελότης*	Vett. Val., Eccles.
† *ἄφιξις*	'departure.'[3] ('arrival,' 'journey,' Xen., Dem., LXX (3 Macc. 7, 18), Aristeas, Dion. Hal., Joseph., Luc., Tatian, Pap.)
† *βλητέον*[4]	Basil.
† *βολίζω*	Eustath., Geopon.
† *δεξιολάβος*	Byzantine writers.
† *διακατελέγχομαι*	
† *διαπρίομαι*	'be enraged.' Euseb. (in other senses, Plat., Hipp., Ar., LXX).
† *διενθυμέομαι*	Eccles.
† *δυσεντέριον*	Moeris.

[1] Lk. 18, 12 ℵ* B; cf. *ἀποδεκατόω* above, p. 27. The Attic form of the simple verb is *δεκατεύω*.

[2] The Latin form is used in Vitruv. 10, 5, as 'pulley,' and as a nautical term (probably 'foresail') by other writers, e. g., Javolenus, *Dig.* 50, 16, 242, Schol. on Juvenal, *Sat.* 12, 69, and (restored by editors) in Sen., *Contr.* 7, 1, 2; Statius, *Silv.* 3, 2 30. Whether originally Latin or Greek the word was taken by Luke from current usage.

[3] But the meaning 'departure' is often possible in earlier occurrences, and in Joseph. *Antt.* ii, 2, 4; Diod. 13, 112 is perhaps probable.

[4] Also Mark 2, 22 according to text. rec.

† ἐξομολογέω [1] 'promise, agree.'
† ἐπιλείχω Longus (*v. l.*).
† [εὐρακύλων]

As analysed by these lists the part of Luke's vocabulary taken as significant for the purposes of the present investigation divides itself in the following proportions:

A. Common Attic words or words affected by the Atticists..... 137
B. Words used chiefly by one of the ancient writers..... 27
C. Words found first or chiefly in poetry..... 87
D. Words belonging to the post-classical prose, including Aristotle.... 202
E. Words first used by Luke..... 22

These figures may be compared with those of Schmid by means of the following tables. Table I shows the number of words in each of the above classes for the several authors. Table II affords a better means of comparison by giving the same facts reduced to percentages, 100 per cent in each case being the total number of words in the writer's vocabulary that are considered significant, *i. e.* not of common occurrence in all grades and all ages of ancient Greek writing.

TABLE I

Class	Dio Chrysostom	Lucian	Aristides (Schmid, II, 244)	Aelian (Schmid, III, 272)	Philostratus II (Schmid, IV, 428)	Luke and Acts
A	364	1825	805	673	1498	137
B	98	619	162	246	326	27
C	117	1736	350	861	1216	87
D	164	1300	143	575	728	202
E	26	891	101	319	757	22
Total	769	6371	1561	2674	4525	475

[1] Ebeling finds a parallel in TbP 183, ii B. C.

TABLE II

Class	Dio Chrysostom	Lucian	Aristides	Aelian	Philostratus II	Luke and Acts
A	47%	29%	52%	25%	33%	29%
B	13	10	10	9	7	6
C	16	27	23	32	27	18
D	21	20	9	23	16	42
E	3	14	6	11	17	5
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

The result at first sight is quite as would be expected. Every element of a Hellenistic vocabulary appears in Luke, but the post-classical element is considerably larger than in any of the Atticists which Schmid studies.

There are, however, some considerations that make the difference between Luke and the Atticists really less than appears. For on examining the list of post-classical words we notice:

1. There are a number of words found in it which occur in Luke only in passages derived from the LXX, Mark, or Q. It is true that these words are part of his vocabulary, but in view of their obvious origin, especially those in formal quotations from the Old Testament, it would perhaps be fairer to leave them out of consideration.

2. A number of the words in this list are found before 200 A.D. only in Jewish and Christian writers, and may therefore be considered part of a special local or technical vocabulary of Jewish Christian writers rather than a really typical part of Luke's normal Greek style. Some of them are plainly Jewish Greek terms as *τὰ ἄζυμα*, *ἀμήν*, *ἀπερίτμητος*. They also may be subtracted or at least discounted in considering Luke's Greek vocabulary. Schmid himself affords some precedent for omitting such words from list D or transferring them to E.[1] In fact his whole attitude towards the New Testament — treating its vocabulary as a test of the un-Attic

[1] For example, from the vocabulary of Lucian, which is the most fully treated of all (I, 400), Schmid omits entirely

ἀντιμετρέω	New Testament.
ἐπισκοπή	LXX, New Testament.
πλάξ	LXX.

and vulgar,[1] indicates that the margin of error is likely to be on the side of underrating the classical element in its writers.

But the significant fact about the comparisons is that, in spite of this large dilution of Luke's vocabulary with post-classical words, it includes also a large number of Attic words — a number quite as large in proportion as the same element in at least two of Schmid's authors, Lucian and Aelian.

Of course too much confidence must not be placed upon these numerical comparisons of vocabulary. The great variety exhibited by the proportions in the vocabularies of the five authors studied by Schmid warns us against making too much of slight differences of proportion. Apparently the Atticists themselves gathered their vocabulary from the different sources in very different ways.

The value of the study of Luke's vocabulary which we have been here undertaking seems rather to lie, first, in the endeavor to select from it those words which may be looked on as significant, and, second, in arranging those words so as to show the different elements in Luke's vocabulary. Besides, it makes possible a safe comparison of Luke's vocabulary with that of various other writers. While the results of such a comparison can not be stated more definitely than the general impressions of every reader of Luke's work, they are at least better founded. And in particular it justifies itself by showing that the vocabulary of Luke, while it has its natural affiliations with the Greek of the Bible, is not so far removed from the literary style of the Atticists as to be beyond comparison with them.

The question may be pertinently asked whether the gulf between New Testament Greek in general and Attic or Atticistic Greek is not

while he lists among the words first used by Lucian

ἀποκυλίω	LXX, New Testament, Josephus.
ἀμεταν όητος	New Testament, Philo.
ἐξορκιστής	New Testament, Josephus.

Note also his omission of these rare words:

διθάλασσος	New Testament, Strabo, Dio Chrys.
ἐπαναπαύω	LXX, New Testament, Aelian.

[1] This is shown by his use of a special sign (†) throughout his lists for words absent from New Testament Greek, and by his omitting altogether from his summaries of lists A, B, and C, in IV, 635–679, words occurring in the New Testament.

being exaggerated in our day owing to our fresh knowledge of the vernacular Greek through the papyri. If so, the exaggeration is probably due to two factors, namely, the overrating of the purely imitative and classical element in the so-called Atticists, and the underrating of the literary element in the vocabulary of the New Testament writers. I am inclined to revolt slightly also from the extreme view of Deissmann and Moulton, who minimize the Semitic or Biblical or Jewish element in the New Testament and ascribe such phenomena to the vernacular Greek of the time. I have already indicated that much of Luke's post-classical vocabulary appears to be due to a distinctly Jewish-Christian language. This is probably even more true of his post-classical syntax. And still more allowance must be made if it is assumed that in some parts of his work he consciously imitates the LXX or Mark.

3. THE ALLEGED MEDICAL LANGUAGE OF LUKE*

In the year 1882, W. K. Hobart published under the title "The Medical Language of St. Luke," an elaborate investigation into the vocabulary of Luke, aiming to show, mainly by quoting parallels from medical writers, that the language of the third Evangelist has a distinctly medical tinge. Some attempts in the same direction had been made before Hobart,[1] though he was acquainted with only one, an article that appeared in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for June, 1841. To the large mass of material which Hobart collected no additions seem to have been made since,[2] though Zahn and Harnack [3] have greatly strengthened the argument by selecting from Hobart only the most convincing examples.

Hobart summarizes his argument as follows:

"We have in the account of the miracles of healing, or their opposites, in the third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles, medical language employed.

"In the general narrative, outside of medical subjects, we find, wherever we have an opportunity of comparing it with the other New Testament writers, that Luke strongly inclines to the use of medical language.

* For the Notes on this Chapter see below, pp. 51 ff.

" Even where in the general narrative a comparison cannot be instituted with other New Testament writers, we find words occurring uniformly throughout which were in use in medical phraseology, and which from habit and training a physician would be likely to employ.

" In estimating the weight of the argument it should be remembered that the evidence is *cumulative*, and that the words adduced as examples are very numerous, considering the extent of St. Luke's writings." [4]

The evidence of Hobart and the thesis for which it was compiled seem to have been very widely accepted by New Testament scholars. Of recent English writers alone who accept this argument (with more or less caution) the following may be mentioned: Plummer,[5] Hawkins,[6] Knowling,[7] Ramsay,[8] Chase,[9] Peake,[10] Stanton,[11] Moffatt.[12] Among German scholars Zahn and Harnack [13] have become the active champions of the theory, and now Harnack [14] claims even P. W. Schmidt and Clemen as converts, though their conversion is apparently hardly complete. The former considers that " a good acquaintance with medical art and terminology is the most that can be asserted of ' Luke.' " [15] The latter limits medical characteristics to the " We " sections.[16]

The arguments of Hobart need testing. A careful examination of them was recommended some years ago by Johannes Weiss,[17] but has not been forthcoming. Some writers treat Hobart's work with respectful attention, others with contempt.[18] A few protests have been raised against it,[19] but apparently none by English or American scholars. What is needed is a complete consideration of all the factors involved. This may be a thankless task, but in view of the importance attached to the argument from the alleged medical language in upholding the traditional authorship of Luke and Acts it is a necessary one.

A great deal of the material so assiduously collected by Hobart has of itself no independent value. There are many words so common in all kinds of Greek that their appearance in Luke and Acts and in the medical writers is inevitable, e.g., ἀναιρεῖν, ἀπαιτεῖν, ἀπορεῖν, ἀσφαλής, βία, and the like. Hobart attributes Luke's use of σύν to the fact that " in his professional practice, St. Luke would have been in the constant habit of employing this word, as it was

almost always used in the formula of a prescription, etc., and thus became an almost indispensable word to a physician." [20]

Plummer has pointed out that of Hobart's long list of words:

"More than eighty per cent are found in LXX, mostly in books known to St. Luke, and sometimes occurring very frequently in them. In all such cases it is more reasonable to suppose that Luke's use of the word is due to his knowledge of LXX, rather than to his professional training. . . . If the expression is also found in profane authors, the chances that medical training had anything to do with Luke's use of it become very remote. It is unreasonable to class as in any sense medical such words as ἀθροίζειν, ἀκοή, ἀναιρεῖν, ἀναλαμβάνειν, ἀνορθοῦν, ἀπαιτεῖν, ἀπαλλάσσειν, ἀπολύειν, ἀπορεῖν, ἀσφάλεια, ἄφεσις, etc., etc. All of these are frequent in LXX, and some of them in profane authors also." [21]

The figures for Josephus are no lower. From Krenkel's lists [22] it appears that of the 400 words in Hobart's index about 300 occur in both LXX and Josephus, 27 in LXX but not in Josephus, while 67 are in Josephus but not in LXX.[23] So that Josephus, who as a single author makes a fair parallel to Luke, uses ninety per cent of the "medical words" listed by Hobart. A comparison of Hobart's list with the lexica of two profane authors of the same period, Plutarch and Lucian,[24] shows that over ninety per cent of the list is found in one or both of these two authors. Of the remaining thirty or forty words few seem to have any strikingly medical signification in Luke. It is clear, therefore, that Hobart's list contains very much that is without significance, many of his words being common words without any special medical use. While he shows most diligently that the words he catalogues are employed by the medical writers, he does *not* show that they are *not* employed by other writers with no professional training. Even those who accept his argument realize this. "He has proved only too much," says Harnack.[25]

Yet it is frequently argued that even when the worthless examples are subtracted from Hobart's list the residue is still quite sufficient to prove his point, that when the material is thoroughly sifted, as Weiss recommended, cogent proofs will still remain. For this reason Zahn and Harnack have selected the most striking examples, and it will evidently be more just for us to confine our argu-

ment to their selections. For further examination we shall divide their examples into four general groups:

A. General words
B. Medical words
C. Ordinary words used in a medical sense
D. Longer expressions

In the following lists "H" means that the example is cited by Harnack, "Z" that it is cited by Zahn. Since most of this chapter was written, a similar list of selections has appeared in Moffatt's *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament* (1911). Many of them are coincident with the selections of Harnack and Zahn, the others are generally less convincing.[26] Some of them are referred to incidentally throughout this chapter and in the Excursus appended to it by the letter "M."

In these lists the occurrence of words in Lucian, Plutarch, Josephus, and LXX is noted, but the citations from Josephus are not exhaustive as there is no complete lexicon of his works. A few other notes are appended to the words and expressions in all the lists. A complete account of the occurrences of these terms in non-medical writers would occupy a great deal of space.

A. General Words

[ἀγωνία] (HZ)	LXX, Joseph., Plut., Luc.
ἀνακαθίζω[27] (HM)	Plut.
ἀνάψυξις (HMZ)	LXX.
ἀποψύχω (HMZ)	LXX, Joseph., Luc.
ἀσιτία (HMZ)	Joseph., Plut., Luc. (*Gallus* 23 *v. l.*)
ἄσιτος (HZ)	Joseph., Plut., Luc.
ἀτενίζω (Z)	LXX, Joseph., Plut., Luc.
βοήθεια (H)	LXX (freq.), Joseph., Plut., Luc.
ἐκπνέω[28] (HZ)	Joseph., Plut.
ἐκψύχω[29] (HMZ)	LXX, Plut.
ἐμπνέω (HZ)	LXX, Joseph., Plut., Luc.
ἐνοχλέω (MZ)	LXX, Joseph., Plut., Luc. (freq.)
ἐξαιφνής (Z)	LXX, Joseph., Plut.
ἐπιμελῶς (HM)	LXX, Joseph., Plut., Luc.
ζωογονέω[30] (HZ)	LXX, Plut., Luc.

ἡμιθανής [31] (HZ)	LXX (4 Macc. 4, 11)
θέρμη (HM)	LXX, Joseph., Plut., Luc.
ἰκμάς (MZ)	LXX, Joseph., Plut., Luc.
κατακλείω (Z)	LXX, Joseph., Plut., Luc.
καταψύχω (HMZ)	LXX, Joseph., Plut.
κλινάριον [32] (H)	
κλίνη (H)	LXX, Joseph., Plut., Luc.
κλινίδιον [32] (H)	Joseph., Plut. (freq.), Luc. (*Asin.* 2)
κράββατος (H)	
ὀθόνη (HZ)	Joseph., Plut., Luc.
ὀθόνιον (HZ)	LXX, Joseph., Plut., Luc.
ὀχλέω (MZ)	LXX, Joseph., Plut.
παρενοχλέω (Z)	LXX, Joseph., Plut., Luc.
πλήμμυρα (MZ)	LXX, Joseph., Plut.
πνοή (HZ)	LXX, Plut.
προσδοκάω (HMZ)	LXX, Joseph., Plut., Luc.
προσδοκία (MZ)	LXX, Joseph., Plut., Luc.
προσρήγνυμι (MZ)	Joseph.
τὰ σιτία (Z)	LXX, Joseph., Plut., Luc.
στηρίζω (H)	LXX, Plut., Luc.
συκάμινος (MZ)	LXX, Joseph. (*Antt.* viii. 7, 4 *v. l.*), Plut.
συκομορέα [33] (MZ)	
συμπίπτω (MZ)	LXX, Joseph., Plut., Luc.
τραυματίζω (Z)	LXX, Joseph., Plut., Luc.
ὑποζώννυμι (HM)	LXX, Joseph., Plut., Luc.

B. Medical Words

ἀνάπηρος (HMZ)	LXX, Joseph., Plut.
ἄτεκνος (Z)	LXX, Joseph., Plut., Luc.
δυσεντέριον [34] (Z)	
ἔγκυος (Z)	LXX, Joseph., Plut.
ἕλκος (HZ)	LXX, Plut.
ἑλκόομαι (HZ)	Plut.
ἰδρώς (Z)	LXX, Joseph., Plut., Luc.
κραιπάλη (HMZ)	Plut., Luc.
ὁλοκληρία [35] (HZ)	LXX, Plut.
παραλελυμένος (HMZ)	LXX, Joseph., Plut.
ῥῆγμα (MZ)	LXX, Joseph., Plut., Luc.

σπαργανόω (Z)	LXX, Plut.
στεῖρα (Z)	LXX, Joseph., Plut., Luc.
σφυδρόν [36] (H)	
τραῦμα (Z)	LXX, Joseph., Plut., Luc.
ὑδρωπικός (H)	Plut.
χάσμα (H)	LXX, Joseph., Plut., Luc.
χρώς (HMZ)	LXX, Joseph., Plut., Luc.

C. Ordinary Words Used in a Medical Sense

ἀδύνατος (H)	'crippled,' LXX, Plut., Luc.
ἀνακύπτω (HM)	of recovery, LXX, Joseph., Plut.
ἀνορθόω (HM)	of recovery, LXX, Luc.
ἀπαλλάσσω (MZ)	of recovery,[37] Joseph., Luc.
ἀπολύω (H)	of recovery, LXX, Joseph.
ἀποχωρέω (Z)	of recovery.
ἀρχαί = πέρατα [38] (HZ)	LXX, Plut.
ἀχλύς (HMZ)	of blindness,[39] Joseph., Plut., Luc.
βλάπτω (HMZ)	of physical injury, LXX, Joseph., Plut.
ἔκστασις (HMZ)	'fit, trance,' LXX, Plut.
ἐπιβλέπω (HMZ)	'examine,' [40] Plut.
ἐπιμελέομαι (HMZ)	of medical care, Luc.
ἐπιμέλεια (HZ)	of medical care, LXX,[41] Plut., Luc.
θηρίον = ἔχιδνα [42] (HZ)	Plut., Luc.
ἵστημι (HZ)	'stop, stanch,' [43] Plut.
καθάπτω (H)	'infect.' [44]
[καταβαίνω] (HZ)	'fall,' of liquids, LXX, Joseph.[45]
καταδέω (Z)	'bandage,' LXX (Ecclus. 27, 21), Joseph.
καταπίπτω (HMZ)	'fall,' of persons, LXX, Joseph., Luc.
ὀδυνάομαι (HZ)	of pain, LXX, Joseph., Plut., Luc.
παραχρῆμα (HZ)	of sudden change in health, Joseph.
πιμπράομαι (HMZ)	'swell,' LXX, Joseph., Plut., Luc.
ῥίπτω (HMZ)	of convulsions.
σκότος (H)	of blindness, LXX, Joseph., Plut., Luc.
συλλαμβάνω (Z)	'conceive,' LXX, Plut., Luc.
συνέχομαι (HZ)	'be afflicted with,'[46] LXX, Joseph., Plut.
συστέλλω (H)	'shroud.' [47]

D. Longer Expressions

πυρετὸς μέγας (HMZ)	
πλήρης λέπρας (HM)	
ἔχω ἐν γαστρί [48] (Z)	LXX
συλλαμβάνω ἐν γαστρί (Z)	LXX (Gen. 25, 21 *v. l.*).[49]
[*θρόμβοι αἵματος*] (H)	"frequent from Aesch. down."
ἐπιχέω ἔλαιον καὶ οἶνον (HZ)	(*ἐπιχέω ἔλαιον*, LXX, Plut.) [50]
εἰς μανίαν περιτρέπω [51] (HZ)	Luc.
καταφέρομαι ὕπνῳ, etc. (HMZ)	Joseph., Plut., Luc.
πυρετοί (HZ) (plural)	Joseph., Plut., Luc.
ἀπέπεσαν λεπίδες (HMZ)	(*ἀποπίπτω*, LXX, Joseph., Plut., Luc.) (*λεπίς*, LXX, Joseph., Plut.)
ἄσιτοι διατελεῖτε [52] (HMZ)	
τρῆμα βελόνης [53] (HMZ)	(*τρῆμα*, Polyb., Joseph., Plut.) (*βελόνη*, Plut., Luc.)
οὐδὲν ἄτοπον, τί ἄτοπον (HZ)	LXX, Joseph., Plut.
ἀναδίδωμι ἐπιστολήν (MZ)	
οὐκ ἄσημος πόλις (HMZ)	

In reviewing these lists anyone familiar with the common vocabulary of Hellenistic Greek will easily see that there are few words in them that are of unusual occurrence. The notes indicate that for several of these even the medical writers do not offer satisfactory parallels. List B can not be given too much weight, as it is natural that any writer's description of purely medical matters should find parallels in the books of medicine. And if there is any argument from the cases (List C) where Luke uses words in the same technical sense as do the doctors, this argument is more than offset by the many cases quoted by Harnack, Hobart, Moffatt, and Zahn themselves in which words that have a special technical meaning among the doctors are used by Luke in an entirely different sense.[54]

List D is no doubt the most specious of all. The first two examples, which Harnack calls *termini technici* for "great fever" and "acute leprosy," are not very convincing when Luke's fondness for the adjectives *μέγας* and *πλήρης* is remembered; [55] *οὐδὲν ἄτοπον, τί ἄτοπον*, seem to be regular expressions for something "out of the way," i.e., either criminal or disastrous; [56] *ἀναδίδωμι ἐπιστολήν* and similar expressions are common in the papyri.[57] *οὐκ ἄσημος* was

evidently a common litotes and perhaps especially applied to a man's origin.[58] Is it likely that Luke got these last two phrases from the letters of Hippocrates, five hundred years old ? [59]

Hobart, Zahn, and Harnack all group together the differences between Luke and the parallel passages in Matthew and Mark, and make a special point of them.[60] These differences, it is claimed, show the marks of a physician. The examples are of two kinds:

1. Substitution by Luke of synonyms of medical character.
2. Additions, omissions, or changes in the description of patients or cures that show an interest in medicine.

1. In comparing the language of Luke with the synonyms in Mark or Matthew, the fact that the term in Luke is found in the medical writers does not prove that he was a physician, for a well educated person such as Luke evidently was, even without special medical training would use more technical terms than a less educated person. The general difference between Luke and the other synoptists is shown elsewhere to be a marked difference in culture.[61] Harnack admits that three of the examples that he quotes as substitutions of medical synonyms are also verbal improvements, viz.:

ῥίψαν	Luke 4, 35	for *σπαράξαν*	Mark 1, 26
παραλελυμένος	Luke 5, 18	for *παραλυτικός*	Mark 2, 3
γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ	[Luke] 22, 44	for *ἤρξατο ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι* ("unclassical")	Mark 14, 33

Zahn recognizes verbal improvements in two: [62]

κλινίδιον	Luke 5, 19, 24	for *κράββατος*	Mark 2, 4, 11
ἰκμάς	Luke 8, 6	for *ῥίζαν*	Mark 4, 6

Three other examples are in accord with the known preferences of the Atticists:

βελόνη	Luke 18, 25	for *ῥαφίς*	Mark 10, 25, Matt. 19, 24 [63]
κακῶς ἔχων	Luke 7, 2	for *βασανιζόμενος*	Matt. 8, 6 [64]
πλήμμυρα	Luke 6, 48	for *βροχή*	Matt. 7, 25 [65]

The only other examples of this kind in Harnack and Zahn are:

προσρήγνυμι	Luke 6, 48,49	for *προσπίπτω*	Matt. 7, 25–27
προσρήγνυμι		*προσκόπτω*	
συμπίπτω		*πίπτω*	

ῥῆγμα		*πτῶσις*	
ἵστημι	Luke 8, 44	for *ξηραίνω*	Mark 5, 29 [66]
ῥύσις		*πηγή*	
τραυματίζω	Luke 20, 12	for *δέρω*	Mark 12, 5

But *ῥύσις* is found in the parallel in Mark (5, 25), and *δέρω* is used by Luke in the same context (20, 11). The remaining examples have been considered in the lists above. Note that both Josephus (*B. J.* i. 17, 4) and Lucian (*Philopseud.* 31) use *συμπίπτω*, as does Luke (6, 49), of a house falling in.

On the other hand a number of good medical terms are found in Matthew and Mark but not in Luke. Here are a few examples, those limited in the New Testament to one or both of these evangelists being marked as in Hobart by an asterisk. *

* *ἄγκιστρον*	Matt., name of a surgical instrument.
* *αἱμορροέω*	Matt., substituted for *οὖσα ἐν ῥύσει αἵματος* in Mark, Luke.
* *ἄνηθον*	Matt. (Hippocr., Theophr *et al.*)
* *ἀφρίζω*	Mark.
ἄρρωστος	Matt., Mark, once elsewhere in New Testament (1 Cor. 11, 30).
βρυγμός	Matt. (once in Luke also, from Q)
* *διυλίζω*	Matt. (Dioscor., *et al.*)
* *ἐρεύγομαι*	Matt.
* *κολοβόω*	Matt., Mark, "properly to amputate" (Swete on Mark 13, 20).
* *κυλλός*	Matt., Mark (Hippocr.)
* *κύμινον*	Matt.
* *κώνωψ*	Matt.
* *μυρίζω*	Mark.
ξηραίνω	of paralysis, Mark. [67]
* *προσκεφάλαιον*	Mark.
* *πυρέσσω*	Matt., Mark.
πώρωσις	Mark, Paul (see J. A. Robinson, *Ephesians*, p. 264).
* *σκώληξ*	Mark (for the medical use of the word, see Hobart, p. 43.)[68]
* *σμυρνίζω*	Mark (Dioscor. and very late writers only).

2. The other arguments for the medical language of Luke based on a comparison with Matthew and Mark are such general differences as the following:

"In the description of Jesus' healing work Luke sometimes writes more fully than does Mark, and with greater vividness." (Zahn, p. 146.)

"Luke often indicates how long the person healed had been afflicted." (Zahn, p. 147.)

"In the cure of the epileptic boy (St. Luke, 9, 38 ff. = St. Mark 9, 17 ff.) St. Luke adds in the description of the patient: ἐξαίφνης κράζει (*scil.* the evil spirit) . . . καὶ μόγις ἀποχωρεῖ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ συντρῖβον αὐτόν." These "interpolations elucidate the description of the disease by telling of symptoms that are characteristic of epilepsy." (Harnack, pp. 183, 186 f.)

"The addition in both these cases (Luke 6, 6; 22, 50 f.) that it was the right hand and the right ear respectively is a token of exactness which is specially intelligible in a physician." (Harnack, p. 185.) [69]

But there are some converse facts in a comparison of the synoptic Gospels that these writers do not mention:

In Luke 4, 39 = Mark 1, 31 = Matt. 8, 15, Luke alone omits the fact that in curing the woman Jesus took (Matt. touched) her hand.[70] In fact Luke frequently omits reference to touching or laying on of hands where Matthew and Mark mention it.[71] Again with all his "special interest in methods of healing" Luke does not mention (9, 6) as does Mark (6, 13) that the twelve on their mission of preaching and practicing anointed their patients with olive oil. In Matthew (8, 6) the patient healed at the request of a Capernaum centurion is plainly described as παραλυτικός, but in Luke (7, 2) merely as one very sick and about to die (κακῶς ἔχων ἤμελλεν τελευτᾶν). It is Matthew (5, 39), not Luke (6, 29), that says "*right* cheek" in Jesus' dictum on non-resistance.[72]

Even in the healing of the epileptic boy referred to by Harnack, as just quoted, the facts turn quite the opposite way. As in the case of another demoniac (Luke 8, 26 ff. = Mark 5, 1 ff.), Luke omits or explicitly contradicts all reference to a self-destructive tendency on the part of the patient. Here he also omits such symptoms as deafness, dumbness, foaming, grinding the teeth, pining away, falling and rolling, death-like coma on the ground.[73] He also omits from Mark the question and answer in reference to the duration of the disease (παιδιόθεν, Mark 9, 21), and the statement that Jesus took the patient by the hand (Mark 9, 27), and commanded the spirit not only to leave him but never to return.[74] Still Harnack

asserts (p. 187); "Very nearly all of the alterations and additions which the third Evangelist has made in the Markan text are most simply and surely explained from the professional interest of a physician. Indeed, I cannot see that any other explanation is even possible." [75]

Examples of medical language in an author to have their fullest weight should be words that are used elsewhere only or mainly in medical writers. Hobart not only includes many words used frequently by other than medical writers, but apparently is at no pains to show that many of Luke's words are used principally or exclusively by medical writers.[76] Zahn speaks of his examples as "words and turns of phrase found elsewhere only in the medical books," [77] but does not make plain which of them fulfil this description. It is certain that nearly all of them do not.[78]

The selected examples of Harnack, Moffatt, and Zahn do not impress us with their technical character. Yet even if we accepted them as medical terms, the argument derived from them would not be fully convincing. It is still possible that they could have been used by a non-medical man. We have no way of knowing how far medical language had penetrated into the vocabulary of every day life. The vocabulary of the doctor and the layman always coincide to a considerable degree. We know how many of the simpler medical terms are found in common speech to day, especially on the lips of educated men, and we may well think of conditions in the first century as in this respect much like our own. It is entirely possible, then, that much medical language had already become part of common speech.[79] If we are to accept the definition of Hobart as to what constitutes a medical term, we have already seen that many such words are found in the LXX, Josephus, Plutarch, and Lucian. Kennedy indicates that about ten per cent of the more uncommon words in the LXX are to be found also in Hippocrates. His proportion for the New Testament as a whole is nearly as large.[80] In his study of the Atticists Schmid finds constant affiliations in vocabulary between them and Hippocrates and the other medical writers.[81] Medical borrowings have been asserted for Polybius [82] and even for Xenophon's Anabasis.[83] Many Latin authors also use medical terms.[84]

Any sound argument for the medical bias of Luke's vocabulary not only must show a considerable number of terms possibly or probably medical, but must show that they are more numerous and of more frequent occurrence than in other writers of his time and degree of culture. Even were we to accept Hobart's long list of medical terms, it remains to be proved that the examples are more abundant and more strikingly coincident with medical language as we know it than those which could be collected from Josephus, Philo,[85] Plutarch, or Lucian. "The evidence is cumulative," [86] but it must also be comparative. Otherwise the conclusions will be thoroughly subjective.[87] The question that presents itself, therefore, is not whether there are many parallels between the diction of Luke and that of the medical writings, but whether these parallels are more numerous or more striking than those which can be found in non-professional men, writing with the same culture as Luke and on similar subjects. If not, the argument of Hobart and the rest is useless.

So far as I know this test has never been applied to the question of the medical language of Luke. To apply it fully for only one other author would be a large task, requiring the "remarkable industry" of another Dr. Hobart. Yet at least a rough test should be made. In an excursus appended to this chapter is given the result of a preliminary investigation of the "medical language" of Lucian, carried on in the manner of Hobart, Harnack, and Zahn. Lucian was chosen as being nearly a contemporary and a fair parallel to Luke. Both writers have a large vocabulary [88] and a ready command of Greek. Lucian was an Asiatic Greek who travelled into the western world. This is also the tradition about Luke the physician.[89] But otherwise the test was chosen entirely at random.

The results given are very incomplete. But a complete study is here not necessary, as we are trying to learn, not whether Luke is a little more medical in diction than his nonprofessional contemporaries, but whether the difference is *striking*. And the test case quite sufficiently proves that it is not. The style of Luke bears no more evidence of medical training and interest than does the language of other writers who were not physicians. This result, it must be confessed, is a purely negative one. It is probably futile to try to carry the argument further, as Clemen does, and to argue from the

language of Luke and Acts that a physician *could not* have written them.[90] One cannot know to-day what an ancient physician could not have written. Of course the absence of marked medical traits does not prove that a doctor did not write Luke and Acts. To judge from the fragments that remain, Ctesias, the physician, uses no more medical language in his historical work than did his contemporary Xenophon, the soldier and historian.[91] So Luke, " the beloved physician " and companion of Paul, may have written the two books which tradition assigns to him, though their Greek be no more medical than that of Lucian, " the travelling rhetorician and show-lecturer "; but the so-called medical language of these books cannot be used as a proof that Luke was their author, nor even as an argument confirming the tradition of his authorship.

NOTES

[1] *Editorial Note.* — The earlier discussion turned on the question whether "Luke the physician" (Coloss. 4, 14) was the same Luke to whom tradition ascribed the third Gospel and the Acts (Iren., Euseb., Jerome), or, as Erasmus, Calvin, and others surmised, another person, expressly distinguished from the Evangelist by the designation "the physician." The titles of two 18th century dissertations belong to the bibliographical inventory; viz., J. G. Winckler, *Dissertatio de Luca Evangelista medico* (Lips. 1736, 4°), and B. G. Clauswitz, *De Luca Evangelista medico ad Coloss. iv. 14* (Halae Magdeburg. 1740, 4°). The former is duly catalogued in the long list of this multitudinous author's publications (*e.g.*, in Meusel), and down to the middle of the 19th century it was regularly cited in the " literature " on Luke, but I discover no evidence that anybody had seen it in the meanwhile. Clauswitz is likewise unattainable, but some of his illustrations of the Evangelist's medical knowledge are quoted by others.

Wettstein, in his edition of the New Testament (1751; I, 643) wrote: "Exercuisse medicinam Paulus ad Colossenses testatur. Eusebius autem et Hieronymus addunt fuisse natione Syrum Antiochensem: utriusque non obscura prodit indicia in scriptis suis." The evidences he adduced of Luke's professional use of terms (especially in Luke 4, 38, Acts 13, 11) became classical, and those who plough with his heifer have, as usual, such faith in him that they deem it superfluous to look up his references or even read his quotations; otherwise some one would have discovered that Galen does not say that physicians make a technical distinction between big fevers and small ones, but — in two places — that " big fever " is an inaccurate expression (since the nature of a fever is not defined in quantitative terms), though common among physicians (*De comp. medic. per genera*, iii. 2, Vol. XIII, pp. 572 f. Kühn; *De different. febrium*, i. 1, Vol. VII, p. 275; see also his commentary on Hippocrates, *Aphorism.* i, ad *Aphor.* 11, Vol. XVII. ii. p. 388). Inaccurate expressions are quite as likely to be in popular use as to be exclusively professional. In fact,

in the 17th century a physician (Guil. Ader, *De aegrotis et morbis Evangelicis*, Toulouse, 1621; reprinted in *Critici Sacri*, Lond. 1660, Vol. IX, col. 3679 f.), writing about the miracles of healing in the Gospels, remarked on Luke 4, 38, *συνεχομένη πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ*, "Evangelista loquitur ut vulgus, qui *magnas febres* vocat, quas Hippocrates in Epidem. & com. 4. sec. 13. acut. dicit *acutas, continuas, causonides, ardentes*. Quarum fecit duo genera Galenus: Exquisitam nempe, vel notham."

Till after the beginning of the 19th century, Luke's medical language was a standing topic in the principal Introductions to the New Testament. J. D. Michaelis (*Einleitung in die göttlichen Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, 4 Ausg., Göttingen, 1788, pp. 1078 f.), citing Clauswitz, adduces *πυρετὸς μέγας* (Luke 4, 38), *ἀγωνία* (Luke 22, 43), and *ἀχλύς* (Acts 13, 11), as examples of the author's professional knowledge. J. G. Eichhorn (*Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 2 Ausg., Leipzig, 1820, p. 625) disposes of these instances with a commonsense observation. See also Winer, *Biblisches Realwoerterbuch*, 3 Aufl., Leipzig, 1848, II, 34 f.

In the collections from Greek authors to illustrate the New Testament, of which the 18th century was prolific, many of the supposed technical medical terms in Luke and Acts are illustrated from authors not suspected of medical learning; it would perhaps be possible to match in them all the words in Hobart's list which have even a superficial plausibility.

Learned physicians, who should be the best judges, have seldom contributed even their opinions on the question whether Luke was of their guild. The few pages which Dr. John Freind (1675–1728) gives to the subject have therefore an especial interest, for Freind knew the Greek medical writers not through indexes or by skimming their pages for an extraneous purpose, but as both a practitioner, and a historian of ancient medicine, and was besides one of the most accomplished Grecians of his time. In his *History of Physick from the Time of Galen to the beginning of the Sixteenth Century* (1725–26), the first part of which deals with the Greek physicians, Freind remarks that "St. Luke's Greek comes nearer to the ancient standard than that of any other of the Evangelists"—a superiority which he attributes to Luke's Greek medical reading; and that "no doubt merely because he was a physician, when there is occasion to speak of distempers or the cure of them [he] makes use of words more proper for the subject than the others do." Of these peculiarities of Luke's diction Freind gives several illustrations (4 ed., London, 1750, I, 222–225). It is noteworthy that among these none of the words and phrases which have recently been signalized by laymen as technical terms of Greek medicine are mentioned; in fact, no instance of a technical term or technical use of terms is adduced. Luke writes *παραλελυμένος* instead of *παραλυτικός*, "a word never used by the ancient Greek Writers" (not particularly medical writers; compare the popular use of *νεφριτικός*, Galen, *De nat. fac.* i. 13 [II, 31 Kühn]; *ὑστερικός*, Galen, *De loc. affect.* vii. 5 [VIII, 414] — midwife's and woman's word); *ἔστη ἡ ῥύσις*, "more simple and more direct as well as more Physical"; *ἰᾶτο πάντας* (instead of *διεσώθησαν*, *ἐσώζοντο*), "the word that is peculiarly proper for healing"; of the centurion's servant, "St. Luke tells us that they found him not only *recover'd*, but *ὑγιαίνοντα, in perfect health*"; so also in Luke 8, 55, *ἐπέστρεψε τὸ πνεῦμα* [her breath came back], "which he puts in, no doubt as being the first sign of coming to life." "The same

accuracy of expression we may see in regard to the lame" (Acts 3, 7). In Luke's account of the woman who had the issue of blood (Mark 5, 26, *παθοῦσα ὑπὸ πολλῶν ἰατρῶν καὶ δαπανήσασα τὰ παρ' ἑαυτῆς, καὶ μηδὲν ὠφεληθεῖσα ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εἰς τὸ χεῖρον ἐλθοῦσα*), Luke gives these particulars "quite another turn, and softens the passage very much in regard to his faculty, and instead of relating how much she *suffered* by the several Physicians, or how she grew *worse* upon her remedies, he says only that her distemper was above the reach of any of them to remove it; *οὐκ ἴσχυσεν ἀπ' οὐδενὸς θεραπευθῆναι.*" So also *προσαναλώσασα* is a more "proper expression" for paying a doctor's bill than Mark's *δαπανήσασα* ("squandered." The miser in *Anthol.* xi. 171, reckons the doctor's pay and *τί νοσῶν δαπανᾷ*, and concludes that it is cheaper to die).

Freind observes that Basil, "whom his own continual illness made a physician," has a great many allusions and similes taken from the art; and he is inclined to think — as others had done — that the historian Procopius had a medical education, "for in some things relating to Physick he is remarkably more minute and circumstantial than we find any other historian is," as he shows by numerous examples.

Mr. J. K. Walker, in the "Gentleman's Magazine" for 1841 (Part I, pp. 585–587), refers to Freind as "Frend, a medical writer" (!), and repeats some of Freind's illustrations, adding others "which show with equal certainty the professional bias of the learned Evangelist, that have, *as far as I know, escaped attention.*" His list contains: *ὑδρωπικός*, *παραλελυμένος*, *ἀχλύς*, *παροξυσμός* (!), *κραιπάλη*, *συνεχομένη* (Luke 4, 38), *ἴασις*, *πυρετοῖς καὶ δυσεντερίᾳ συνεχόμενος*; Luke's manipulation of the story of the woman with the issue of blood (from "Frend's essays"); and the manner of Herod's (Antipas) death, *σκωληκόβρωτος* (Acts 12, 23). James Smith (*Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*, 1 ed. 1848; 4 ed. 1880, pp. 1 ff.) regards Luke 4, 38 (*συνεχομένη πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ*), Acts 13, 11 (*ἀχλύς*), and the woman with the issue of blood as conclusive; and Lightfoot (on Coloss. 4, 14) deems a reference to Smith sufficient. Hayman (Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, art. "Medicine," Vol. II [1863], pp. 298 f. n.) quotes part of Freind's examples, without reference to the source. Thus the matter stood when Hobart undertook his painstaking investigation, designed to prove that the third Gospel and Acts were written by a physician, therefore by Luke the companion of Paul, thus giving the discussion a new, apologetic turn.

In his book, and in the subsequent discussion, one consideration of fundamental importance is overlooked. Modern medical terminology is a barbarous artificial jargon, consisting partly of terms that have come down from the Greeks, in Greek or translated into Latin, partly of invented terms, coined after the pattern of the ancient, in a Greek or Latin which is often palpably counterfeit. Many medical terms, especially the older ones, have come into common use, frequently supplanting, at least in polite discourse, native English words that mean exactly the same thing; and in recent times various agencies of vulgarization have made the lay public acquainted with hundreds of doctor's words, which they use — or abuse — with a self-satisfied feeling that they are talking the professional lingo.

Greek scientific terminology is the contrary of all this. Its technical terms were native, not foreign; they were not invented, but were real words of the

living language, and in considerable part the everyday names for the thing, more exactly defined, if necessary, but not diverted from their meaning. When the teachers of medicine had occasion to designate things for which the common speech had no satisfactory name, they made descriptive terms from common words by derivation or composition, conformably to the genius of the language, with that creative freedom in which Greek surpasses all other tongues. The meaning of such words, if not their technical definition, was at once evident to every Greek. These were real words, too, and could come into general use unhampered by barbarous form or occult significance.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff ("Die griechische Literatur," in *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, I, 8, 2 edit. 1907, p. 59), writing of Hippocrates, justly says: "Offenbar muss sich erkennen lassen, dass bereits eine ganz scharfe Terminologie ausgebildet ist. Das kann das Griechische (oder vielmehr Ionische) schon so früh, zweifellos für viele Teile der Naturwissenschaft. Das Latein hat es zu einer Terminologie überhaupt nur in der Jurisprudenz gebracht; die modernen Sprachen bringen es zu keiner, es sei denn, sie borgten bei diesen beiden: sie brauchen Kunstwörter, Surrogate, statt der lebendigen, unmittelbar bezeichnenden, die das griechische Sprachgefühl nicht erfindet, sondern findet."

The ignoring — or should I say the ignorance? — of this elementary fact has ludicrous consequences. Thus Walker, Hobart, Harnack, Zahn, and Moffatt, put down κραιπάλη among the words which show Luke to be versed in Greek medical literature. But κραιπάλη is not a technical term coined by physicians to designate mysteriously the puking and the dizzy headache that come after a big dinner and much wine; it is — as these scholars might have read in Galen in so many words (κραιπάλας . . . πάντες οἱ Ἕλληνες ὀνομάζουσι τὰς ἐξ οἴνου βλάβας τῆς κεφαλῆς, actually quoted in full by Wettstein on Luke 21, 31, the verse in which Hobart and his *pedisequi* discover it to be a medical word!) — the vulgar word for that very vulgar experience. Luke did not have to go to medical literature on the diagnosis and treatment of the ailment to pick up a word that was, so to speak, lying in the gutter, any more than Aristophanes consulted Hippocrates to know what to call the consequences of a protracted symposium. And κραιπάλη is only a peculiarly crass example of a pervasive fallacy in the discussion of Luke's "technical language." — G. F. M.]

[2] See, however, Plummer on Luke 6, 1 (ψώχω); 6, 40 (καταρτίζω) and 8, 23 (ἀφυπνόω, 'fall off to sleep'). As a recently added example should perhaps be mentioned πρηνής, Acts 1, 18, which according to Chase, Harnack, and Rendel Harris is to be understood not in the sense of 'headlong' but as 'swollen,' like the form πρησθείς from πίμπρημι 'swell,' which has been conjectured for the passage. (See F. H. Chase in *Journal of Theological Studies*, XIII (1912), 278 ff.; Rendel Harris in *American Journal of Theology*, XVIII (1914), 127–131, and the references there given.) But Chase admits that "in a cursory search, I have not discovered any instance of the adjective πρηνής in medical writers in the sense of 'swollen,' 'inflamed.'" Hobart (p. 186) had already collected a number of examples that show the use of the adjective by the doctors in the sense of 'headlong,' frequently connected by them with ὕπτιος. It is obvious that little weight can yet be give to this example. As curiosities may be mentioned the arguments drawn from alleged medical language to maintain Luke's authorship of Hebrews (Franz Delitzsch, *Commentary*, 1857 [Eng. trans., 1868–70]), of the Pastoral

Epistles (R. Scott, *The Pauline Epistles*, 1909, pp. 339–341), or of Second Peter (Selwyn, *St. Luke the Prophet*, 1901, p. 150 n. 1) and Ephesians (*ibid.*, p. 103).

[3] Zahn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 3d edit. Quoted hereafter (with some reference to the German) chiefly from the English translation, New York, 1909. See especially III, 160 ff., 82 f. Harnack, *Lukas der Arzt*, Leipzig, 1906. Quoted (with some reference to the German) from the English translation, *Luke the Physician*, London, 1907. See pp. 13–17 and Appendix I.

[4] Hobart, pp. xxxv f.

[5] *St. Luke* (International Critical Commentary), 1896, pp. lxiii f.

[6] *Horae Synopticae*, 1899, p. 154; 2d edit., p. 189.

[7] *Expositor's Greek Testament*, 1900, II, 9–11.

[8] *S. Paul the Traveller*, 1900, p. 205; *Luke the Physician*, 1908, chap. i.

[9] *Credibility of Acts*, 1902, pp. 13 f.

[10] *Critical Introduction to the New Testament*, 1909, p. 127.

[11] *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, Part II, 1910, pp. 261 ff. (very guarded).

[12] *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, 1911, pp. 263 f., 298 ff.

[13] Harnack, *Luke The Physician*, p. 14, n. 2; "I subscribe to the words of Zahn [*Introduction*, III, 146], 'Hobart has proved for every one who can at all appreciate proof that the author of the Lukan work was a man practised in the scientific language of Greek medicine — in short, a *Greek physician*.'"

[14] *Neue Untersuchungen zur Apostelgeschichte*, 1911, p. 15. (Eng. trans., *The Date of Acts*, 1911, pp. 1 ff.)

[15] *Festschrift zur Feier des 450-jährigen Bestehens der Universität Basel*, 1910, pp. 16 f. This is about the position taken by Stanton.

[16] C. Clemen, *Hibbert Journal*, VIII (1910), 785 f. Compare the earlier and more direct answer of the same author to Harnack's *Lukas* in *Theologische Rundschau*, X (1907), 97 ff.

[17] Meyer's Commentary, *Lukas*, 8th edit., p. 74. "Eine methodische Sichtung des Materials und Zusammenstellung des wirklich Beweisenden wäre erwünscht."

[18] Jülicher, *Einleitung*, pp. 407 f. (Eng. trans., pp. 447 f.).

[19] See the articles of P. W. Schmidt and Clemen cited above (notes 15 and 16), and the protest of Thumb, quoted below (note 79). See also a few pertinent criticisms by Preuschen in *Berliner philol. Wochenschrift*, XXVIII (1908), col. 1429 ff.

[20] P. 253. Examples could be multiplied indefinitely; e.g., on *ὑπερῷον* Hobart says (p. 185), "This word was very familiar to a physician, being the neuter of *ὑπερῷος*, the feminine of which, *ὑπερῴη*, was the name of the palate," etc.; (p. 272) "*ὑποζώννυμι* is peculiar to St. Luke. . . . He is the only writer who employs this particular compound of *ζώννυμι* for undergirding a ship. . . . The word *ὑποζώννυμι* was a very common one with medical men" — apparently in the participle, *ὁ ὑπεζωκώς* (*ὑμήν*), the membrane lining the thorax (pleura).

[21] Plummer, *op. cit.*, p. lxiv. J. Naylor, "Luke the Physician and Ancient Medicine," in *Hibbert Journal*, VII (1909), p. 29. says: "three hundred and sixty out of Hobart's four hundred words were to be found in the Septuagint, and many of them would have been used by any intelligent Greek writing on the same themes." His figures, amounting to ninety per cent, probably include the Apocrypha.

[22] *Josephus und Lucas*, lists II and III, pp. 302 ff.

[23] Thus 40 more of Hobart's words, or ten per cent more of his list, appear in Josephus than in LXX. Krenkel does not include 1 and 2 Macc. with the LXX, and his lists are otherwise not quite reliable, but they give a simple and approximate answer to our question.

[24] D. Wyttenbach, *Index graecitatis in Plutarchi opera*, Leipzig, 1835. *Lucianus ex recensione Caroli Jacobitz*, Leipzig, 1836–1841. Vol. IV. Index Graecus.

[25] *Lukas der Arzt*, p. 122 n.

[26] One of them, ἐπέπεσεν, rests on an inferior reading in Acts 13, 11.

[27] "In this intransitive sense its use seems, with a few exceptions, to be almost altogether confined to the medical writers, who employ it to describe patients sitting up in bed." (Hobart, p. 11.) But laymen used it in the same way as is shown by the scene at the death-bed of Socrates (Plato, *Phaedo*, 60 B, ἀνακαθιζόμενος εἰς τὴν κλίνην συνέκαμψε τὸ σκέλος) and of Philopoemen (Plut. 368 A, συναγαγὼν μόλις ἑαυτὸν ὑπ' ἀσθενείας ἀνεκάθιζεν). Cf. Plut. *Alex.* 671 D; Xen. *Cyneg.* 5, 19 (of a hare).

[28] Occurs twice in the parallel passage in Mark and frequently in Greek writers, see p. 16.

[29] "Almost altogether confined to the medical writers, and very seldom used by them." (Hobart, p. 37.) To judge from the examples cited by Hobart it means in medical writers to cool off, to have a chill; in Luke it means to expire. So in LXX (Judg. 4, 21 *v. l.*, Ezek. 21, 7); Babr. 115, 11; Herodas 4, 29.

[30] "Used in medical language to signify 'producing alive, enduing with life.'" (Hobart, p. 155.) In this sense the word is common in all "profane" Greek, but Luke, in accordance with the idiom of the LXX, uses the word in the sense of 'keep alive, preserve.'

[31] ἡμιθανής occurs in Dion. Hal., Diod., and Strabo; ἡμιθνής is a much commoner word, used by Thuc., Aristoph., Polyb., Luc., Dion. Hal., Dio Cass., Alciphr. *al.*, and by Galen in the two passages cited by Hobart, p. 27.

[32] "Besides this passage in St. Luke, κλινάριον appears to be found in only two other Greek authors, viz. Aristophanes and Arrian." (Hobart, p. 116.) But Hobart does not cite medical parallels for κλινάριον, κλίνη, κλινίδιον or κράββατος. Both diminutive forms occur in M. Anton., Artemidor., and Pollux.

[33] No example of this word is quoted by the lexica or by Hobart, p. 152. The latter cites Diosc. *Mat. med.* i. 181, but he uses συκόμορον and μορέα = συκαμινέα.

[34] The word in this spelling is not quoted from the doctors by Hobart, p. 52 f., nor is it found elsewhere except in Moeris who condemns it. But δυσεντερία is found in Polyb., Joseph., etc., as well as the doctors.

[35] "The noun ὁλοκληρία does not seem to be used in the medical writers." (Hobart, p. 193.)

[36] Acts 3, 7 (Tisch., W. H.). Found elsewhere only in Hesychius. Harnack (p. 191) says: "Σφυδρόν is a very rare word (e.g., Passow does not give it);" but he then emends (?) σφυρόν in Hobart's example (Galen, *Medicus*, 10 *bis*) to σφυδρόν and quotes it as a parallel. Σφυρόν, the reading of Text. Recept. in Acts, *l.c.* is found in LXX, Joseph., Plut., Luc., and other non-medical writers as well as in Galen, *l. c.*

[37] In some of Hobart's examples the disease is the subject of ἀπαλλάσσω as in Acts 19, 12; [Plato] *Eryx.* 401 C; cf. Soph. *Antigone*, 422. But in most of them the disease is in the genitive as in Joseph. (e.g. *Antt.* vii. 8, 1, ταχέως ἀπαλλαγήσεσθαι τῆς νόσου), Luc. (e.g. *Abdic.* 26, ἰὼ καὶ ταύτην καὶ ἀπάλλαττε ἤδη τῆς νόσου), and other writers.

[38] Eurip., *Hipp.* 762; Herodot. iv. 60; Plut. *Cicero*, 47, *Cato*, 38; LXX (Judges 9, 34); and in Philo, Diod., *et al.* Used in Acts 10, 11; 11, 5 of the corners of the sheet. "The technical expression in medical language for the ends of bandages." (Hobart, p. 218.)

[39] Cf. Erotian, *Lexicon Hippocrat.* s.v. ἀχλυῶδες· ἀχλὺς λέγεται ποιά τις ἀμαύρωσις καὶ σκοτία περὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, ὡς καὶ Ὅμηρος ἐν τῇ ε' τῆς Ἰλιάδος φησίν· [Il. 127] ἀχλὺν δ' αὖ τοι ἀπ' ὀφθαλμῶν ἕλον, ἣ πρὶν ἐπῆεν.

[40] Luke 9, 38. But the word here means rather 'pity' as in Luke 1, 48 and often (over 100 times) in LXX, as is shown by the parallels, Mark 9, 22, *βοήθησον σπλαγχνισθείς*, Matt. 17, 15, *ἐλέησον*. For the medical use, see Plut. *Quaest. conviv.* 682 E, quoting Hippocrates.

[41] Used in Prov. 3, 8 as parallel to *ἴασις*.

[42] Cf. Suidas: *θηρία καὶ τὰ δάκετα. ἔχιες, φαλάγγια, ὄφεις.*

[43] Luke 8, 44, where it is an intransitive verb. So Plutarch, *Consol. ad Apoll.* 106 F (of a river). To judge from the examples in Hobart, pp. 14 ff., repeated by Harnack, p. 186, the medical writers used the verb in this sense transitively. Cf. Pollux, IV, 178.

[44] It is to be noted that Ramsay (*Luke the Physician*, pp. 63 f.) disputes this meaning of the verb and the argument drawn from it. It means, he says, simply 'fasten upon.' Preuschen also notes that apparently Acts uses the active, but the doctors, when they mean 'infect,' use the middle.

[45] E.g. Job 38, 30, *πάχνην . . . ἣ καταβαίνει ὥσπερ ὕδωρ ῥέον*; Ps. 132, 2 *ὡς μύρον . . . τὸ καταβαῖνον ἐπὶ πώγωνα . . .* 3 *ὡς δρόσος Ἑρμὼν ἡ καταβαίνουσα ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη Σιών*: Joseph. *Ant.* ii. 16, 3 *ὄμβροι τ' ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ κατέβαινον.*

[46] "Many exx. in Passow *s.v. συνέχω*, I. a." Grimm-Thayer. Cf. note 55.

[47] Hobart (pp. 37 f.) says that this word "is found only once in classical Greek in the sense it bears in this passage [Acts 5, 6], 'to shroud.' Eurip. *Troad.* 378: *πέπλοις συνεστάλησαν.*" But the doctors use the word to mean 'bandage,' 'compress,' 'contract.' In these or other senses the word occurs in LXX, Luc., Plut., and other writers, and in the New Testament in 1 Cor. 7, 29, but not in Luke or Acts.

[48] Luke 21, 23. But it is also in the two parallel passages, Mark 13, 17 and Matt. 24, 19, and twice besides in Matt.

[49] *λαμβάνω ἐν γαστρί* and *συλλαμβάνω* alone are common in LXX in this sense.

[50] LXX (Gen. 28, 18, *ἐπέχεεν ἔλαιον*); Plut. *Pericl.* 16, *ἔλαιον ἐπιχέουσι.*

[51] "This compound of *τρέπειν*, though often used in medical language, is not employed exactly in the same sense as in this passage." (Hobart, p. 268.) Cf. Joseph. *Ant.* ii. 14, 1 *εἰς ὀργὴν (περι)τραπέν*; ix. 4, 4 *τοὺς παρόντας εἰς χαρὰν περιέτρεψε.*

[52] This exact phrase occurs in Galen, where it applies to voluntary fasting or dieting. In Acts 27, 33 it applies to an enforced fast, perhaps sea-sickness. See Madan in *Journal of Theological Studies*, VI (1904), p. 116.

[53] No exact parallel of this phrase is given by Hobart, p. 60; the nearest, *τοῦ κατὰ τὴν βελόνην τρήματος*, means the puncture made by the needle (Galen, *Sang. in. arter.* 2 [II, 708]).

[54] See for examples, the notes above on *ἀρχαί, ἐκψύχω, ἐπιβλέπω, ζωογονέω, περιτρέπω, συστέλλω* and compare the following:

	Medical Use	Luke's Use
ἀνασκευάζω	cure (Hobart)	subvert
βοήθεια	"a current medical term which is applied to all conceivable objects." (H)	apparently a nautical term
διαχειρίζω	operate (Hobart)	(middle) slay
ἐκλείπω	failure of pulse, etc. (M)	see Luke 16, 9; 22, 32.
ἐπακροάομαι	of auscultation (M)	hear
ἐπιδημέω	be epidemic (Hobart)	sojourn
πτύσσω	roll up a bandage (M)	roll up a book
ῥῆγμα	laceration, rupture (MZ)	fall of a house, ruin
συνδρομή	concurrence of symptoms (Hobart)	concourse of people
τιμωρέω	treat medically, relieve, succour (Hobart)	punish

The evidence of such words as these is ambiguous, to say the least. Granting that the words had a technical sense in the medical profession, would not a doctor be the least likely to use them with a different signification? Would an English physician be more, or less, likely than a layman to use in their non-medical sense such common words as appendix, eruption, operate, pulse, stool, ward?

[55] With ἦν συνεχομένη πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ substituted by Luke (4, 38) for πυρέσσουσα (Mark 1, 30); compare φόβῳ μεγάλῳ συνείχοντο, Luke 8, 37. On the former passage Harnack, p, 184, says, "the medical writers distinguish between 'slight' and 'great' fevers; therefore, the epithet 'great' in St. Luke is by no means insignificant." In reply to this we may quote B. Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu* (Eng. trans., 1894, II, 89 n.): "This is generally regarded as suggestive of Luke's calling of physician, without considering that by no diagnosis could he determine from Mark's laconic account under which of the kinds of fever distinguished by his Galen this case was to be classed. [See note 1. — Ed.] The consideration was much more likely to occur to him that a fever to cure which Jesus employed miraculous aid could not be an easy one to get rid of." To judge from quotations in Hobart the doctors used for severe fevers the adjectives ὀξύς (pp. 32, 53, 127 τῶν ὀξέων ὀνομαζομένων πυρετῶν, 178 *bis*, 210, 233) and σφοδρός (pp. 56, 71, 178) rather than μέγας. Συνέχομαι πυρετῷ is found in Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 15, 5; Oxy. Pap. 896, 33 (316 A.D.)

The argument for πλήρης λέπρας is stated thus by Hobart (p. 5): "It would seem that St. Luke by employing two distinct terms πλήρης λέπρας and λεπρός in his account of these two miracles intended to draw a distinction between the diseases in each case, either that the disease was of a more aggravated type in one case than in the other, or else of a different variety. Now we know that leprosy, even as early as the time of Hippocrates, had assumed three different forms (ἀλφός, λεύκη, and μέλας), 'and it is probable that in the time of our Lord the disease, as it existed in Palestine, did not materially differ from the Hippocratic record of it.' (See *Dict. of the Bible*, Art. 'Leper.') Πλήρης, in this connection peculiar to St. Luke, is frequently thus used in the medical writers. Hipp. *De arte*, 5, καὶ πλήρεες τῆς νόσου, Hipp. *Coac. progn.* 187, πλήρεες οὗτοι εἰσὶ πύου." Few of Hobart's examples are, however, really parallel. Cf. Soph. *Antig.* 1052, τῆς νόσου πλήρης ἔφυς.

[56] LXX, Prov. 24, 55 (30, 20), 2 Macc. 14, 23; Joseph. *Antt.* xi. 5, 2, and often; Polyb. viii. 27 (29), 6 *et al.*; Plut. *De Alex. fortuna*, 341 C *et al.*; Philostr. *Apollon.* vii. 11, vii. 39; Epictet. iii. 2, 17; Theophr. *Hist. plant.* i. 1, 3; Dion. Hal. *De comp. verb.* 25 *ter*, *et al.*, illustrating both uses of the word as applied by Luke. For a number of other examples, see Wettstein on Luke 23, 41 and Acts 28, 6. (The reference Judith 11, 11, should be Job 11, 11; add Job 27, 6), Moulton and Milligan, *Vocabulary*, *s. v.*

[57] ἀναδιδόναι ἐπιστολήν Oxy. Pap. 237 *bis*; Fay. Pap. 130; ἀναδιδόναι ἐπιστόλιον Oxy. Pap. 63, 532; 1295, 15; Tebt. Pap. 448; Giss. Pap. I, 69, 4; ἀναδιδόναι πιττάκιον Oxy. Pap. 1063, and scores of other expressions for delivering receipts, contracts, wills, agreements, etc. With Acts 23, 33, compare Oxy. Pap. 486, 11, ἀνέδωκα τῷ κρατίστῳ ἡγεμόνι ἀναφόριον. Cf. Joseph. *Antt.* xvi. 10, 9; Diod. xi. 45, ἀνέδωκε τοῖς ἐφόροις τὰς ἐπιστολάς.

[58] Strabo has οὐκ ἄσημος πόλις several times; Plutarch has οὐκ ἄσημοι [ἄνθρωποι] Philo, φυλὴ οὐκ ἄσημος, and ἐξ ἐλευθέρων ἴσως καὶ οὐκ ἀσήμων [πατέρων], Dion. Hal. οὐκ ἀσήμων πατέρων, οὐκ ἄσημοι πόλεις, Achilles Tatius ἐλεύθερός τε ὢν καὶ πόλεως οὐκ ἀσήμου. If the expression in Acts 21, 39, must be considered the echo of something, it is much more natural to compare it with ἔστιν γὰρ οὐκ ἄσημος Ἑλλήνων πόλις at the beginning of a famous play (Eur. *Ion*, 8) than with the less similar phrase in the

Hippocratean Epistles (*Epist.* 10, Hercher, *μία πολίων οὐκ ἄσημος*). See W. Nestle, "Anklänge an Euripides in der Apostelgeschichte," in *Philologus*, LIX (1900), pp. 46 ff. Of Josephus Krenkel (p. 249) says that, "bei ihm die Litotes *οὐκ ἄσημος* sehr beliebt ist," and gives nine examples. Cf. Lucian, *Pseudol.* 4, *θεὸς οὐχ ὁ ἀσημότατος*, Eurip. *Herc. Fur.* 849, *ἀνὴρ δ' οὐκ ἄσημος*.

[59] Of course the letters of Hippocrates are not genuine any more than are the letters of other literary and political figures of the classical era in Greece. But in confuting the argument of Hobart and his followers I have taken no advantage of the fact that a large part of the Hippocratean writings are spurious (Alfred Gudeman, "Literary Frauds among the Greeks," in *Classical Studies in Honour of Henry Drisler*, pp. 56 f., 69). Galen recognized only eleven as genuine (*Comm. in Epidem., Praef. ad lib.* vi.), and speaks of the forgeries as of quite recent date (*Comm. in Hippocr. De offic. med.*, p. 2, *χθὲς καὶ πρῴην*). The other medical writers from whom Hobart quotes are "Aretaeus, who lived in the first century after Christ, probably in the reign of Nero or Vespasian; Galen, A.D. 130–200; and Dioscorides, who lived in the first or second century of the Christian era." (Hobart, p. vii.) It is not likely that their writings were known to the almost contemporary evangelist. These objections would probably be met by the assertion that "Greek medical language was particularly conservative in its character, the same class of words being employed in it from the time of Hippocrates to that of Galen" (*ibid.*, p. xxx), and that Luke and the other medical writers of his time were drawing on the current terminology of their profession. If anything like literary dependence is to be thought of between Luke and the doctors it must be remembered that at least in the case of Galen, from whom so many of the examples are quoted, the relationship will have to be the other way, for Galen's date was about 200 A.D. Harnack himself recognizes this. In quoting two striking parallels from Galen to the parable of the Good Samaritan he says (p. 190 f.): "One might almost imagine that Galen had read St. Luke. This is not impossible for he had to do with Christians." Norden, *Antike Kunstprosa*, pp. 518 f., thinks it probable that Galen read the Gospels, and he quotes a very interesting fragment in which Galen himself refers to the parables of the Christians.

[60] Hobart, pp. 54–85; Zahn, p. 147; Harnack, pp. 182–188.

[61] See below, Part II, *passim*.

[62] *Introduction*, III, 136, n. 13.

[63] Lobeck, *Phryn.* p. 90.

[64] Lucian, *Soloec.* 6. But *κακῶς ἔχοντας* of Mark 1, 32, 34 becomes *ἀσθενοῦντας* in Luke 4, 40, and *ἐσχάτως ἔχει* of Mark 5, 23 becomes *ἀπέθνησκεν*, Luke 8, 42.

[65] Lobeck, *Phryn.* p. 291.

[66] In the same passage, Luke substitutes *θεραπεύω* for Mark's *ὠφελέω*, though the latter was according to Hobart (p. 2) "in constant use in medical writers as opposed to *βλάπτω*," and the former "in the strict sense as a medical term means 'received medical treatment'" (Ramsay, *Luke the Physician*, p. 17), a meaning that it will not possibly bear in this passage in Luke. Note the correct use of these two words in the two texts of Tobit 2, 10.

[67] See Ropes, *James*, p. 305.

[68] For some others of these words in Matt. and Mark Hobart himself supplies medical examples, e.g. *ἄνηθον* (p. 37), *ἄρρωστος* (pp. 22, 46, 203), *διυλίζω* (p. 239), *κύμινον* (p. 230), *πυρέσσω* (pp. 31, 33, 85, 98, 121, 196, 213, 272).

[69] Note also the suggestion of Burkitt, *Gospel History and its Transmission*, p. 159 n, in regard to Matt. 5, 29, 30: "It seems to me probable that Luke the Physician preferred to leave out the metaphor of amputation."

[70] It is of just this verse that Harnack (p. 184) says that Luke "has, therefore, an interest in methods of healing." It is of the next verse that Zahn (p. 147) says, "It is Luke alone . . . who notes that the healing was accomplished by the laying on of hands (4, 40), where mention of this act is not made in Matthew (8, 16) or in Mark (1, 34)."

[71] This point will be discussed in Part II.

[72] Notice also that the reed which in Mark 15, 19 is used to beat Jesus on the head is in Matt. 27, 29 put in his *right* hand as a mockery of the regal sceptre. In the saying on offences occurring twice in Matthew, once the warning is against an offending eye or hand (18, 8, 9), once against an offending *right* eye or *right* hand (5, 29, 30). The first version of the doublet is apparently from Mark (9, 43–47), the second form presumably from Q. Shall we say then that Q here shows a doctor's interest, or that John does because in the account of Malchus' ear he like Luke names it as the right ear (John 18, 10)? John (5, 5; 9, 1) also indicates the duration of diseases that Jesus cured, and exact data relative to recovery (4, 52, cf. 11, 39).

And even were such details more numerous in Luke than in the parallels the motive might well be literary rather than medical. So the Chronicler in editing the books of Kings adds the exact year when Asa "was diseased in his feet" (1 Kings 15, 23 = 2 Chron. 16, 12), and the fact that Uzziah's leprosy "broke forth in his forehead" (2 Kings 15, 5 = 2 Chron. 26, 19), all of which embellishments are purely literary according to Torrey, *Ezra Studies*, p. 234. Such changes of Mark by Luke, Wernle calls simply legendary. See his comments in *Die synoptische Frage*, pp. 28, 29,–33, on Luke 4, 33; 6, 6; 22, 50 respectively.

[73] The best parallels to the features of Mark not found in Luke in these two cases of possession are in the two authorities on epilepsy that Harnack (p. 187, n. 1) refers to in Hobart (p. 17 f.), viz. Hippocrates, *Morb. sacr.*, I, 592 f., Kühn, and Aretaeus, *Sign. morb. acut.* i. 5, cf. *Sign. morb. diut.* i. 4. The following are the Greek words:

Mark (but not Luke)	Hippocrates
ἄλαλον	ἄφωνός ἐστιν
ἀφρίζει, ἀφρίζων (Luke μετὰ ἀφροῦ)	ἀφρέει, ἀφρὸς ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ἐκρέει
τρίζει τοὺς ὀδόντας	οἱ ὀδόντες συνηρείκασι
ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐκυλίετο	τοῖσι ποσὶ λακτίζει
ὡσεὶ νεκρός	ἀναβλύει ὥσπερ ἀποθνήσκων
διὰ παντὸς νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας . . . ἦν κράζων	ἐκ νυκτῶν βοᾷ καὶ κέκραγεν τὰ μὲν νύκτωρ τὰ δὲ μεθ' ἡμέραν
κατακόπτων ἑαυτὸν λίθοις	
πολλάκις καὶ εἰς πῦρ αὐτὸν ἔβαλεν καὶ εἰς ὕδατα	ἀεί τι ἄκαιρον δρῶντες

	Aretaeus
κῶφον	βαρυήκοοι
ξηραίνεται	πείρωσίς τινος αἰσθήσιος
διὰ παντὸς νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας	ἄγρυπνοι
ἐκ τῶν μνημείων (Luke ἐκ τῆς πόλεως)	ἐξάνθρωποι, ἀμίκτοι

Hippocrates also describes the effects of the "sacred disease" on patients of different ages, including those "with whom it has grown up and increased since youth (ἀπὸ παιδίου)." Cf. ἐκ παιδιόθεν in Mark. Note also that Luke 9, 39, substitutes the simple λαμβάνει for Mark's technical term for catalepsy καταλάβῃ (9, 18; see references to Celsus in Swete *ad loc.*).

[74] Wernle, *Die synoptische Frage*, p. 24, says of this passage; "Die Erzählung vom Epileptischen, die bei Mr 16 Verse umfasst, erzählt Lc in 7 Versen, da ihre Einzelheiten ihn nicht interessierten."

[75] Ramsay in general accepts the medical language of Luke, but the proof of it drawn from Luke's changes in Mark he does not "remember to have seen adequately discussed." His own treatment of these will scarcely supply the want. He says (*Luke the Physician*, p. 57 f.):

"Even in passages that have been taken over by Luke from the Source which we still possess almost in its original form in the Gospel of Mark, wherever there occurs any reference to illness or to the medical treatment of sick persons, Luke almost invariably alters the expression more or less, as in v, 18 he changes the term "a paralytic" of Mark ii, 3 to "a man who was paralysed." He could hardly ever rest satisfied with the popular untrained language used about medical matters by Mark.

"In some cases the change does not imply really more than is contained in the original Source, and amounts only to a more scientific and medically accurate description of the fact related in the Source. But in other cases a real addition to knowledge is involved, as appears, e.g., from the following examples:

"1. Mark iii, 1 speaks of a man with a withered hand; Luke vi, 6, adds that it was the right hand: the medical mind demands such specification.

"2. Luke viii, 27 adds to Mark v, 2 that the possessed man had for a long time worn no clothes: this was a symptom of the insanity that a physician would not willingly omit.

"3. In Luke viii, 55, the physician mentions that Jairus' daughter called for food (cf. Mark v, 42). Various other examples occur."

Of the three examples given by Ramsay in this passage the first has been considered above; the second is a case where Luke according to his custom (see Part II) anticipates a detail which needs explanation in the sequel, the symptom of nakedness is implied in the ἱματισμένον of Mark 5, 15; the last is apparently a mistake, for the request that food be given to the girl is found in Mark 5, 43, as well as in Luke. Pfleiderer has curiously enough made just the converse mistake by overlooking the passage in Luke. He says (*Primitive Christianity*, II, 23) that Mark alone has preserved this little touch of realism. It is moreover Jesus, not Jairus' daughter, who in both Gospels calls for food for her.

[76] Out of Hobart's list of more than 400 words I find only five which he speaks of as altogether or nearly limited in use to medical writers. In three of them he is followed by Harnack (pp. 188, 193 f.). These three have already been examined above: ἀνακαθίζω (note 27); ἐκψύχω (note 29); συστέλλω (note 47), and found unsatisfactory. Another case of Hobart's is ἐνισχύω, of which he says (pp. 80 f.): "With respect to this word it is remarkable that outside of the LXX its use in the transitive sense, 'to strengthen,' is confined to Hippocrates and St. Luke. All other writers who employ it do so in the intransitive sense, 'to prevail,' 'be strong.'" But in its transitive sense the word occurs apparently only once in Hippocrates (*Lex*), but in the LXX more than fifteen times, while in Luke it is found only in the very doubtful passage, [Luke] 22, 43, 44. In Acts 9, 19, on the other hand, it is used in its common intransitive sense. The fifth example is εὐφορέω, Luke 12, 16, 'be fruitful,' of which Hobart (p. 144) says, "used in this sense by St. Luke, Hippocrates and Galen only." But it is used in this sense in Josephus *B. J.* ii. 21, 2 and Philostratus, *Apollon.* vi. 39; *Imag.* ii. 34 (cited by Schmid, *Atticismus*, IV, 358), and in Geopon., Greg. Nyss., and other later writers. In Lucian (*Lexiph.* 15) it is used in a different sense of ships (though Passow confuses this with the New Testament passage).

Harnack makes this claim of one other word, but with as little foundation as the cases already considered. He says (p. 178; cf. Moffatt, p. 299 n.): "Nor is it without significance that the heat is described as θέρμη; for this word, rare, I believe, in ordinary use, and only found here in the New Testament, is among physicians the general term used for θερμότης, as Hobart (p. 287) shows by very numerous examples." But an investigation of the actual occurrence of the two synonyms shows that while in Plato and Aristotle θέρμη occurs less often than θερμότης, it occurs more often than θερμότης in Greek comedy and lyric poetry, in LXX, in Plutarch and Lucian (see p. 66); it occurs also in Josephus, Aristides and Aelian, and according to Lobeck (*Phryn.* p. 331) in Ctesias, Pherecrates, Philo, Arrian, etc. It should be observed also that θερμότης occurs frequently in medical writings, as in Galen, *Humor. comm.* ii. 22 (XVI, 283) *bis*, and passages cited in Hobart, pp. 67, 81, 82, 83, etc.

With regard to the expressions καταφερόμενος ὕπνῳ βαθεῖ and κατενεχθεὶς ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕπνου, Acts 20, 9, Harnack (p. 180), says: "Hobart has (pp. 48 ff.) pointed out that this word, peculiar to St. Luke in the New Testament, is so usual in medical phrasecology (and only in it) for 'falling asleep' that the word 'sleep' is often omitted. . . . Passow also only gives medical authorities for καταφέρεσθαι and καταφορά in the sense of sleep." But Wettstein alone gives examples from Aristotle, Josephus, Diodorus, Plutarch, Lucian, Alexander, Herodian, Parthenius, and Eustathius. On the other hand Thayer (*s. v.*) considers both expressions in Acts to have a different meaning from that found in the doctors and other "profane authors."

The best illustrations of words not found outside the writings of Luke and the doctors, συγκυρία ("rare," Hobart, p. 30) and ἀνωτερικός ("very rare," Hobart, p. 148), appear to have been overlooked by Hobart's followers. Except for later writers these words are cited from no other sources. See also List 4, p. 19.

[77] *Introduction*, III, 162, n. 5. In the German, "Worten und Redewendungen die nur auch bei den Medicinern gebräuchlich sind."

[78] It is doubtful whether the argument for the medical language of Luke gains much from the fact that the examples used are sometimes found only in Luke among New Testament writers. It is with particular emphasis that Hobart and Moffatt star words peculiar to Luke, and Harnack and Zahn remark frequently, "occurs in the New Testament only in the Lukan writings," "is not met again in the New Testament," "here only in the New Testament.," etc. It must be confessed that in all lexical study of the New Testament such facts have played an important part; but it seems to the present writer that their significance has been greatly overestimated. It must be remembered that the New Testament is, linguistically at least, a merely accidental collection of a very limited number of books, on a considerable variety of subjects. As a result the words peculiar to any New Testament writer (as may be seen from the lists in the Appendix to Thayer's Lexicon) are many of them words common in all periods of Greek writing, and typical neither of the vocabulary nor even of the grade of culture of the author. The words *characteristic* of a New Testament writer are a very different kind of list, and cannot be determined without reference to the LXX and profane Greek as well as to the other writers in the New Testament. If Luke's medical knowledge is to be proved by his diction, the proof examples should be shown to be both characteristically Lukan in this sense and characteristically medical. What words belong to the latter category it is difficult for us to know to-day. Perhaps it is safe to assume that the early glossaries to Hippocrates include the terms in his works which would be obscure to a layman in the age of Luke. Of over 1700 such words in the combined index of Franz's edition (Leipzig, 1780) of the glossaries by Erotian, Galen, and Herodotus,

only one word, διατρίβειν, is cited as a medical term in Luke by Hobart (p. 221; on p. 16 f. he declines to take πνεῦμα, Luke 8, 55, in the sense of "respiration" which the glossaries give it for Hippocrates). See also note 39.

[79] Cf. A. Thumb, *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus*, Strassburg, 1901, pp. 225 f.

"Für Quellenuntersuchungen innerhalb der hellenistichen Literatur ergibt sich noch ein anderer Grundsatz: man darf den Wortschatz zweier oder mehrerer Schriftsteller, sofern er dem Bestand der κοινή zugeschrieben werden muss, nicht benützen, um die Abhängigkeit des einem von anderen daraus zu folgern. . . . Dass Lukas eine Reihe medicinischer Ausdrücke gebraucht, die bei Hippokrates und andern Aerzten sich finden, beweist kein Studium der medicinischen Schriften, sondern höchstens die Kenntnis der üblichen medicinischen Terminologie: aber manche der Ausdrücke wie ἔχειν ἐν γαστρί (vgl. neugr. ἐγγαστρώνομαι), ἔγκυος (neugr. ebenso), στεῖρα, oder βελόνη (letzteres statt ῥαφίς für die Nadel des Chirurgen, neugr. βελόνι) sind jedenfalls so allgemein gebrauchte Bestandteile der gesprochenen Sprache gewesen, dass ihnen überhaupt kein Wert für quellenkritische Feststellungen zukommt."

[80] Kennedy, *Sources of New Testament Greek*, pp. 32 f.; cf. pp. 93 f.

[81] See the word lists throughout this work. Schmid says (*Atticismus*, IV, 659): "Dass die Schriften des Hippokrates auch von Nichtmedicinern in der Atticistenzeit noch gelesen wurden, zeigen mehrfache Entlehnungen einzelner Ausdrücke des H. bei unseren Autoren; sie waren nie vergessen; aber einen stärkeren Einfluss auf die Diktion der Atticisten hat H. nicht geübt; nur eine *vox Hippocratea*, ἀραιότης, kommt bei mehreren von ihnen vor."

[82] Götzeler, *De Polybii elocutione*, p. 15 f., cited by Schmid, *l. c.* Wunderer in his *Polybios-Forschungen*, Part I (Leipzig, 1898), pp. 88 f., also finds evidence of medical knowledge in phrases and proverbial expressions of the historian. Although he confesses that the Hellenistic age was characterized by a "Verallgemeinerung der medicinischen Kentnisse," even among the laymen, he adds, "Polybios legt überall, wie ich an den bemerkenswerten Vergleichen zeigen werde, besonderes Interesse für medicinische Fragen an den Tag und muss in der That eingehende medicinische Studien nicht bloss in der Jugend, sondern auch während der Abfassung seines Geschichtswerkes gemacht haben."

[83] Th. Beck in *Correspondenz-Blatt für Schweizer. Aerzte*, XXXV (1905), No. 24.

[84] On medical language in Seneca, for example, see K. F. H. Marx, "Uebersichtliche Anordnung der die Medizin betreffenden Aussprüche des Philosophen L. Ann. Seneca," in *Abhandl. d. königl. Gesellschaft der Wissensch. zu Göttingen*, XXII (1877); C. S. Smith, *Metaphor and Comparison in the Epistulae ad Lucilium of L. Annaeus Seneca*, Baltimore, 1910, pp. 39 ff., 100 ff.; D. Steyns, *Etude sur les métaphores et les comparaisons dans les œuvres en prose de Sénèque le philosophe*, Gand, 1907.

[85] Wendland, *Urchristliche Literaturformen*, p. 335, asserts: "Aber diese [ärztlichen] Kenntnisse gehen nicht über das Mass hinaus, das bei gebildeten Laien vorauszusetzen ist. Eine umfassende, meist für ein weites Publikum bestimmte medizinische Literatur, darunter zahlreiche von Laien verfasste Schriften, auch öffentliche medizinische Vorträge haben eine gewisse Vertrautheit mit ärztlicher Kunst und Terminologie verbreitet. Philos Kenntnisse auf dem Gebiete gehen erheblich weiter als die unseres Autors [Lukas], und doch ist er kein Arzt gewesen."

[86] Hobart, p. xxxvi; cf. Plummer, p. lxiv.

[87] The necessity of comparative evidence is recognized by Zahn (*Introduction*, III, 130 n. 1) in a similar linguistic argument — the alleged dependence of Luke on Jose-

phus — but he does not seem to have applied the principle to his own arguments on the dependence of Luke on the medical writers. In refuting the argument of Krenkel, he says: "His method is not to be commended. . . . The only list of words which really belongs here is that of the words common to Luke and Josephus, not found in the LXX. And this would be significant only if very familiar words were excluded, such as are found quite universally in literature since Homer." And he suggests that "it would be necessary to compare other authors known not to be dependent on Josephus, who might show points of resemblance to Luke in content and form," such as Philo, Polybius, and the historians that followed, down to Herodian. "If this extended investigation should show a special resemblance between Luke and Josephus in language and style," it still could be explained otherwise than by interdependence.

Zahn goes so far in this inconsistent attitude toward the theories of Krenkel and Hobart that he even rejects the same example when proposed by the former, but accepts it as an argument from the latter. I refer to his treatment of parallels to *αὐτόπται γενόμενοι*, Luke 1, 2. He says (*Introduction*, III, 82 f., n. 5): "Luke's language does show the most striking resemblance to that of the medical writers from Hippocrates to Galen, as has been conclusively shown by Hobart. This is noticeably true in the prologue. . . . Hobart cites from Galen not less than 11 instances of *αὐτόπτης γενόμενος, γίνεσθαι, γενέσθαι*." But a few pages later (p. 130, n. 1) he rejects Krenkel's list of parallels to Luke from Josephus because it contains very familiar words, "such as are found quite universally in literature since Homer. . . . In this class belongs also *αὐτόπτης*, Luke 1, 2, upon which Krenkel (pp. 55, 56, 305) lays weight; whereas it is used by Herodotus, iv. 16; Polybius, i. 4, 7, iii. 4, 13, and frequently — generally with *γίνεσθαι*, as in Luke."

[88] Schmid, *Atticismus*, I, 431 n., says: "Es giebt wahrscheinlich keinen griechischen Prosaiker, dessen Wortvorrat reichhaltiger wäre, als derjenige des Lucian. Die Zahl der von ihm angewendeten Wörter beträgt beiläufig 10,400 (bei Plato etwa 9,900, bei Polybius etwa 7,700)." For the size of Luke's vocabulary, see above, Chapter I. Schmid is, however, scarcely right in assigning to Lucian a larger vocabulary than any other Greek prose writer. Plutarch apparently uses more than 15,000 words according to a rough calculation in Wyttenbach's Lexicon.

[89] Hobart (p. xxxi) notes that both Luke and the medical writers came from Asia Minor.

[90] Some of Clemen's arguments are of interest:

"Truly the author of these writings employs some medical terms in their technical sense, but in a few cases he uses them in such a way as no physician would have done. E.g. in the description of Christ's prayer in Gethsemane his sweat is compared with *θρόμβοι αἵματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν*, i.e. not with great drops of blood, as the English version has it, but with clots of blood, which here of course not even for comparison's sake can be thought of." "Could a Greek physician represent the good Samaritan (Luke 10, 34) as pouring on the wounds of the man who had fallen among robbers oil and wine?" (*Hibbert Journal*, VIII (1910), pp. 785 f.). On *ἀπέπεσαν λεπίδες*, Acts 9, 18, he writes: "Ein Arzt musste doch wissen, dass dabei nichts vom Auge abzufallen braucht." (*Theol. Rundschau*, X (1907), p. 102.)

[91] At the beginning of his treatise "On the Natural Faculties" Galen explicitly deprecates and renounces the use of technical terms: "We, however, for our part, are convinced that the chief merit of language is clearness, and we know that nothing detracts so much from this as do unfamiliar terms; accordingly we employ those terms which the bulk of people (*οἱ πολλοί*) are accustomed to use." [Brock's translation, in *Loeb Classical Library*, p. 3.]

EXCURSUS

MEDICAL TERMS IN LUCIAN*

THE object of this study is to investigate the diction of Lucian for medical terms after the manner adopted by Hobart, Harnack, and Zahn for Luke.

Of the 400 words in Hobart's index, 300 appear in the index to Lucian. It would be natural to suppose that there are 100 words in Lucian but not in Luke that could with equal propriety be called medical terms, so that the total size of his medical vocabulary would be no smaller than that of Luke.[1]

Of the 100 specially selected examples chosen by Zahn and Harnack, nearly half are found in Lucian's works. They are so marked "Luc." in the lists above, but it will be worth while to quote a few of the cases in full:

ἀποψύχειν is used in Luke 21, 26 in the meaning 'faint, fail,' and is cited by Harnack (p. 197) and Zahn (p. 161) as a medical term. "But medical writers use ἀποψύχειν of *being chilled*, not of swooning or expiring." (Plummer, *ad. loc.*) See the examples in Hobart, p. 166. So Lucian, *Vit. auct.* 25, and elsewhere, uses it of limbs growing cold or stiff, like Niobe's.

Lucian, *Dial. mar.* 7, ἀνορθώσας δὲ αὐτὴν ὁ Ἑρμῆς γυναῖκα παγκάλην αὖθις ἐποίησε, referring to the restoration of the heifer Io to the form of a woman. "ἀνορθοῦν likewise is the usual medical word for the restoring of the members or parts of the body to their natural position." (Harnack, p. 189, referring to the story of Luke 13, 11 ff.)

In Lucian, *Ocyp.* 45, the lame (χωλός 41) attendant is called ὑπηρέτης[2] ἀδύνατος γογγύζων γέρων. "The man of Lystra, lame from his mother's womb, is described as an ἀνὴρ ἀδύνατος τοῖς ποσίν (Acts xiv, 8). See the medical examples for ἀδύνατος in Hobart, p. 46." (Harnack, p. 193.)

Lucian, *Herm.* 86, τοσαύτην ἀχλὺν ἀποσεισάμενος[3] τῶν ὀμμάτων. "Hobart, pp. 44 f. shows that ἀχλύς, according to Galen, is a distinct disease of the eyes." (Harnack, p. 193).

Lucian, *Tox.* 43, ὁ λέων ἀφεὶς ἐκεῖνον ἠμιθνῆτα. Cf. Luke 10, 30, οἱ λῃσταὶ ἀπῆλθον ἀφέντες ἡμιθανῆ. On ἡμιθνής, see above, p. 56, note 31. This, and not ἡμιθανής as Harnack says (p. 190), is the word used by Galen.

Lucian, *Philopseud.* 11, ὑπὸ ἐχίδνης δηχθέντα . . . τὸ θηρίον δακεῖν. "The fact that the viper (ἔχιδνα) is called θηρίον is not without significance; for this is just the medical term that is used for the reptile. . . . Hobart further

* For the notes on this chapter see below, pp. 71 f.

remarks (*loc. cit.*, p. 51) that 'Dioscorides uses *θηριόδηκτος* to signify bitten by a serpent'" (Harnack, p. 178). Similarly in Lucian's *Dipsades* a reptile like the *ἔχιδνα* (4) is called *θηρίον* (6), *πίμπρασθαι* is used of the swelling from the bite (4) as in Acts 28, 6 (cf. Hobart, p. 50, Harnack, p. 179), and other medical details are mentioned with apologies to the medical poet Nicander (9).

Lucian, *Dial. mar.* 11, 2, *ἡ θέρμη ἀπὸ τοῦ πύρος*. Cf. Acts 28, 4. "Nor is it without significance that the heat is described as *θέρμη*; for this word, rare, I believe, in ordinary use, and only found here in the New Testament, is among physicians the general term used for *θερμότης*, as Hobart (p. 287) shows by very numerous examples." (Harnack, p. 178.) As a matter of fact the doctors use *θερμότης* also, e.g. Galen, *Humor. comm.* ii. 22 (XVI, 283 *bis*). See above, p. 62, note 76.

Lucian, *Dial. mort.* 28, 2, *στείρα καὶ ἄγονος διετέλεσας*. On *στεῖρα* see Zahn, p. 160. With the construction of *διατελέω* ("very much used in medical language" — Hobart, p. 278) compare *ἄσιτοι διατελεῖτε*, Acts 27, 33 in List D above (p. 45).

Lucian, *Dial. meretr.* 2, 4, *ἐς ὕπνον κατηνέχθην*. Cf. Acts 20, 9, *καταφερόμενος ὕπνῳ βαθεῖ* . . . *κατενεχθεὶς ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕπνου*. "Passow only gives medical authorities for *καταφέρεσθαι* in the sense of sleep; cf. the multitude of instances quoted by Hobart (from Hippocrates to Galen), some of which closely coincide with the passage we are considering." (Harnack, p. 180.) One of Hobart's instances has *κατενεχθέντας εἰς ὕπνον*, but none use *ὕπνῳ* or *ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕπνου*.

"Let it be observed that Luke avoids the following terms for sickness which are not customary with medical men, *μαλακία*, *βάσανος*, *βασανίζεσθαι* (Matt. iv, 24, viii, 6, ridiculed by Lucian, *Solocc.* 6)." (Zahn, p. 160.)

Lucian, *Vera hist.* i. 22, *συλλάβῃ τὸ ἔμβρυον*. For *συλλαμβάνω* without *ἐν γαστρί* of conception see Luke 1, 24, 36; Zahn, p. 160.

Lucian speaks of lunatics, *Philopseud.* 16, *καταπίπτοντας πρὸς τὴν σελήνην* . . . *καὶ ἀφροῦ πιμπλαμένους τὸ στόμα*. *Tox.* 24, *ἐλέγετο δὲ καὶ καταπίπτειν πρὸς τὴν σελήνην αὐξανομένην*. "Καταπίπτω — here only in the New Testament — can also be vouched for from medical language (Hobart, pp. 50 f.)." (Harnack, p. 179.) "Καταπίπτειν, peculiar to St. Luke, is used of persons falling down suddenly from wounds, or in epileptic fits." (Hobart, p. 50.)

Though all these general observations are significant, yet for any comparison of Lucian with Luke it would not be fair to match the whole extent of Lucian's writings against Luke's work of only 150 pages. One point in Hobart's argument is that his "examples are very numerous considering the extent of St. Luke's writings." Are the "medical terms" of Lucian as numerous *proportionately* as the medical terms of Luke?

To answer this question a small section of Lucian was examined more minutely for comparison. Three pieces, the *Alexander*, the second part of the *True History*, and the *Death of Peregrinus* were chosen purely on the basis of subject matter as forming a kind of parallel to Luke's stories of miracles and travel and martyrdom.

The total extent of these three writings of Lucian is about half that of the works of Luke.

In this limited section of Lucian were found about 115 of the words considered medical by Hobart, or over one-fourth of his entire list. It was also found that these words occur about half as often in this section of Lucian as they do in Luke's work of twice the size. In other words, the frequency of occurrence of these words is about the same in the two writers. And this fact is all the more remarkable in view of the fact that many words are included which are distinguished by Hobart as especially frequent in Luke and used by him much oftener than by other New Testament writers.[6]

Still more remarkable are the figures for that other class of words on which Hobart lays so much weight — the words peculiar to Luke in the New Testament. About 75 of this class, or about one-fourth of all the words starred by Hobart, are found in the section of Lucian examined, and, as for frequency of occurrence, it actually appears that these words "peculiar to Luke" occur at least twice as often in Lucian as they do in Luke himself. The times of occurrence of these 75 words in the three writings are very nearly as follows:

Luke	50
Acts	75
Lucian (section the size of Luke *or* Acts)	150

But of course it is not necessary to limit our study of medical terms in Lucian to those words which happen also to occur in Luke. The parallel should be made quite independently of Luke, but after the manner and method of Hobart, Harnack, and Zahn, especially the two last. Accordingly, from the 75 pages of Lucian examined, I have formed four lists of words corresponding to the four lists formed for Luke from the examples of Harnack and Zahn. In addition I have compiled a fifth list of the kind already suggested,[7] of words whose use in extant writers seems to connect Lucian with Hippocrates and the doctors. It will be remembered that such a list has not been produced for Luke. Those who put weight on the evidence of words in Luke but not in the other New Testament writers will observe that these words occur neither in Luke nor, with few exceptions, elsewhere in the New Testament.[8]

A. General Words

1. Words of rare occurrence but found in medical writers.
2. Words used frequently by doctors, or akin to such words.
3. Words used by doctors as technical terms.

ἀναχαίνω, cf. Hobart, p. 33.
ἀνιμάω, Aret. *al.*
ἀπαρτάω
γαλακτώδης, Hipp.
γερόντιον, Hipp. *al.*
δίαιτα, 'diet,' Hipp.
διαπνέω, cf. Hobart, p. 236.
διασήπω, Theophr. *Hist. plant.*
διερείδω, cf. Hobart, p. 280.
ἐγχρίω, of eye salve, Rev. 3, 18.
ἐντεριώνη, Hipp., Arist., Theophr.
ἔξωρος, Hipp. *al.*
ἐπιδημία, cf. Hobart, p. 188.
κατακλίσις, 'a way of lying in bed,' Hipp., cf. Hobart, p. 69.
κατόπιν, Hipp. *al.*
καῦσις, 'cautery,' Heb. 6, 8.
κοιλαίνω, of ulcers, Hipp.
κόλλα, cf. Hobart, p. 128.
κορώνη, 'apophysis of a bone' (term. tech.).
κρᾶσις
μολύβδινος, Hipp. *al.*
ὀθόνινος, cf. Hobart, pp. 218 f.
ὁμιχλώδης, Theophr., *Caus. plant.*
παραβύω
περιπνέω, cf. Hobart, p. 236.
σκέψις, of medical examination, Hipp.
σκευαστός, cf. Hobart, p. 232.
σκίλλα, Hipp. *al.*
συγκολλάω, cf. Hobart, p. 128.
συναγωγεύς, a kind of muscle, Hipp.
τρυπάω, Hipp. *al.*
τύρβη, Hipp. *al.*
ὑπερπίμπλημι, Hipp. *al.*, cf. Hobart, p. 107.
ὑποπίμπλημι, cf. Hobart, p. 107.
ὑποτύφω
ὑποφρίττω, rare outside of Lucian, but found in Galen.
χαίνω, cf. Hobart, p. 33.

B. Medical Words*

ἀλεξιφάρμακον, medical writers
ἀναφλάω
ἄσαρκος, Hipp. *al.*
γομφίος
ἑλλέβορος (ἑλλεβορίζω)
ἐμέω, Rev. 3, 16
θηλή
κιννάμωμον (κινναμώμινος), Rev. 18, 13
κολοκύνθη (κολοκύνθινος), Diosc. *al.*
κυτμίς
κύω
λύζω
μαλάχη, medical writers
μελαγχολέω
μηρός, Rev. 19, 16
πύελος
πώγων

* Diseases, medicines, and parts of the body.

C. Ordinary Words Used in a Medical Sense *

ἄκοπον (sc. φάρμακον), 'painkiller,' *Alex.* 22. Cf. Galen's work, περὶ ἀκόπων, and elsewhere in Galen.

ἁρμογή, 'joint' of the body, *Alex.* 14. Only Galen XIX, 460, cf. II, 734, ed. Kühn, are cited in the lexica for this meaning.

ἀρτηρία, 'wind pipe,' *Alex.* 26. Frequently so in the doctors.

διηγέομαι, of the *post mortem* account, *Peregr.* 44. Cf. Hobart, pp. 229 f.

δριμύς, of drugs, *Peregr.* 45. Hipp., Theophr., Diosc., Galen. In Hipp. *Fract.* 769 it is used without φάρμακον in the same sense.

ἐπισκοπέω, of medical examination, *Peregr.* 44. So used by Galen.[9]

στρουθίον, as name of a plant, *Alex.* 12. "Name of plant in Hipp., Theophr., Diosc., *et al.*" (Passow, *s.v.*). Contrast Luke 12, 6.

ψυχρόν (without ὕδωρ), 'cold water,' *Peregr.* 44. Hippocr. *et al.* So Matt. 10, 42, but not Mark 9, 41, nor in Luke.

D. Longer Expressions

πυρετὸς μάλα σφοδρός, *Peregr.* 44.

λευκὸς τὴν χρόαν, *Alex.* 3.

νεκρικῶς τὴν χρόαν ἔχειν, *Peregr.* 33.

κοιλὴ ἡ χείρ

εἰς μανίαν ἐμβάλλω, *Alex.* 30.[10]

ἄσιτος ἐκαθέζετο, *Vera hist.* ii. 24. Cf. Acts 27, 33.

διατελέω χρώμενος, *Alex.* 5. Cf. Galen, *Comp. med. sec. loc.* vii. 2 (XII, 19, Kühn), φαρμάκοις χρώμενοι διατελῶσιν, cited by Hobart, p. 278.

σκωλήκων ζέσας, *Alex.* 59. "σκώληξ is used both of worms in sores and of intestinal worms," Hobart, p. 43, quoting this passage.

ἀναισθητῶς ἔχειν, *Vera hist.* ii. 1. Hipp.

συμμύω τὸ στόμα, *ibid.*, ii. 1. Hipp.

ὁ ἰατρὸς μετακληθείς, *Peregr.* 44. "These two compounds of καλέω [εἰσκαλέω, μετακαλέω], peculiar to St. Luke, were used in medical language for 'to call in' or 'send for' a physician," Hobart, pp. 219 f.[11]

* By both Lucian and the medical writers.

E. Special List Connecting Lucian and the Medical Writers[12]

1. Words apparently found elsewhere only in the medical writers.

2. Words found in no writer before Polybius except Hippocrates.

ἀλέα	Hipp. *al.*
ἀμβλυωπέω	Hipp., not in Attic writers.
ἐπιβρέχω	Theophr., Diosc.
ἐπιχλιαίνω	Stephanus quotes only Hipp. besides.
ἡμιτόμιον	Diosc.; Passow cites no other authors.
καταθηλύνω	Lexica refer only to Luc. (*ter*) and Hipp.
καταρράπτω	Hipp., Galen.
κολλύριον	Hipp., Galen., Diosc., Rev. 3, 18.
κορύζη	Lexica refer only to medical writers besides.
μαστίχη	Theophr., Diosc.
προσοκέλλω	Aretaeus and later writers.
συλλείβομαι	Hipp., Arist.
φλογμός	frequent in Hipp.

The following observations may also be made:

1. Hippocrates is directly referred to in *Vera hist.* ii. 7, Ἱπποκράτει τῷ Κῴῳ ἰατρῷ.

2. *Vera hist.* ii. 47 closes in much the same way as Galen makes his transitions between the seventeen books of his *De usu partium*, e.g., Book vi, *ad fin.*, περὶ ὧν ἁπάντων ὁ ἐφεξῆς τῷδε λόγος ἐξηγήσεται.

3. The preface to the *Alexander* has a certain resemblance to the preface of Dioscorides' *Materia medica*. This, it will be remembered, is the preface that Luke is said to have imitated.[13] Its resemblance to Luke and Lucian is equally close.

4. If the medical coloring of certain passages is to be examined, as Harnack, pp. 15 f, 176 ff., examines the story of Acts 28, 3–10, probably *Alex.* 21, or *Peregr.* 44, 45, would make a sufficient parallel.

5. Harnack (p. 175) suggests as one of the traces of the author's medical profession that "the language may be coloured by the language of physicians (medical technical terms, metaphors of medical character, etc.)." For medical technical terms, see Lists

B and C; for metaphors of medical character, see O. Schmidt, *Metapher und Gleichnis in den Schriften Lukians*, 1897, pp. 13 ff.

6. Harnack (p. 176) says that these signs will "compel us to believe that the author was a physician if . . . in those passages where the author speaks as an eyewitness medical traits are especially and prominently apparent." In *Peregr.* 44, 45, and in many other places where the medical traits are most numerous, Lucian also is writing as an eyewitness — even in the *True History*!

These suggestions do not exhaust the passages in Lucian, but probably they are enough for our purpose. Already they match in nearly every detail the evidence produced for the medical profession of Luke. And if the amount of Lucian examined should be doubled so as to equal in extent the writings of Luke, and if we then should "spend a lifetime" in going through the twenty-five volumes containing the writings of Hippocrates, Galen, Dioscorides, and Aretaeus, with occasional glimpses at Theophrastus, to collect the occurrences of words and note coincidences in their usage or combination with this part of Lucian, there can be no doubt that such an investigation could produce a volume quite as large as Hobart's, and that the best examples selected from it would be found quite as cogent as those of Harnack, Moffatt, and Zahn, to prove by his "medical language" that Lucian was a physician.

NOTES

[1] The following words occurring in Lucian but not in Luke or Acts are explicitly mentioned as medical terms by Hobart himself in the course of his book (pages of Hobart in brackets): ἀγών (81), ἀθυμία (280), ἀνάδοσις (260), ἀνανεύω (240), ἀναπνέω (236), ἀναρπάζω (244), ἄσκησις (263), ἄτακτος (222), ἄτονος (241), ἄφορος (144), βιβρώσκω (42), διοχλέω (232), δοχεῖον (158), ἐξαρπάζω (244), ἐφεδρεύω (260), ἐπιτα-ράττω (93), εὔφορος (144), καταναλίσκω (16), κατορθόω (262), ὁλόκληρος (193), πιέζω (62), πῆρος, -όω, -ωσις (148 f), πρόχειρος (202), σκευάζω, (232), συνεδρεύω (260), συνταράσσω (93), συντρέφω (223), συντυχία (30), ταραχώδης (93), ὑποδοχή (158), ὑποταράσσω (93), φορός (144), ψαύω (62).

[2] ὑπηρέτης is a medical term, according to Hobart, p. 88.

[3] "The compounds of σείειν were used by the medical writers." (Hobart, p. 103.)

[4] "Hobart also makes an attempt to prove by examples that ὕπνος βαθύς is a specific medical phrase; but I pass this by." (Harnack, p. 180, n. 1). The phrase occurs in Lucian, *Tim.* 6.

[5] "ἀφρός is used by Hippocrates and Aretaeus in describing the symptoms of epilepsy." (Hobart, p. 17.)

[6] E.g.,

Times in	Luke	Acts	Lucian
ἀναιρέω	2	18	4
διέρχομαι	10	21	3
ἰάομαι	11	4	2
καταβαίνω	14	19	2
πίμπλημι	13	9	1
πλῆθος	7	16	9
σύν	23	32	2
σώζω	15	13	1
ὑπάρχω	15	25	3
	110	157	27

But excluding these nine words the 108 other words occur approximately

102	149	226

or nearly twice as often in Lucian as in either half of Luke's work.

Totals	212	306	253

[7] See p. 49.

[8] The exceptions are marked on the lists by the New Testament references. Five out of the eight are in Revelation. It should be observed that in compiling these lists "medical terms" actually occurring in Luke as well as in Lucian have been excluded.

[9] Cf. ἐπιβλέπω, above p. 44.

[10] Cf. Acts 26, 24, τὰ πολλά σε γράμματα εἰς μανίαν περιτρέπει, which Hobart (p. 268) considers medical, though he confesses that περιτρέπω is not employed exactly in this sense by medical writers. But ἐμπίπτω and ἐμβάλλω, which Hobart also considers medical words (pp. 130, 137), are probably used by the doctors as in Lucian. Note Hobart's quotation from Galen: ὥσπερ καὶ τοὺς εἰς ἐπιληψίαν τε καὶ ἀποπληξίαν ῥᾳδίως ἐμπίπτοντας.

The nearest parallel to Acts, *l.c.*, is not in the doctors but in Lucian's *Abdicatus* 30. This passage has apparently been overlooked by commentators (Wettstein does not use it, though he illustrates περιτρέπειν by two other passages in Lucian). In referring to the countless forms of madness (μυρία εἴδη; cf. Aretaeus, cited by Hobart, p. 267, μανίης τρόποι εἴδεσι μὲν μυρίοι) and its various causes he says: γέροντας δὲ καὶ διαβολὴ ἄκαιρος καὶ ὀργὴ ἄλογος πολλάκις κατ' οἰκείων ἐμπεσοῦσα τὸ μὲν πρῶτον διετάραξεν, εἶτα κατ' ὀλίγον ἐς μανίαν περιέτρεψε. Not only is this passage full of other words which Hobart would call medical (besides διαβολή, ἄλογος, ἐμπίπτω, διαταράσσω, occur in equally medical connections in the next few lines λύπη, ἀποτελέω, σωτηρία, ἀπαλλάσσω, θεραπεία, ὁμοτέχνος ἐπανέρχομαι), but the whole piece is written from the doctor's view point with the most delicate sympathy for his professional sensitiveness.

[11] εἰσκαλέω also is used in this sense in Lucian: ὁ ἰατρὸς εἰσκληθείς, *Pseudol.* 23; but not by Luke, εἰσκαλεσάμενος οὖν αὐτοὺς ἐξένισεν, Acts 10, 23, the only occurrence in the New Testament.

[12] This list of words, intended to illustrate the criticism of the examples used for the medical language of Luke, contains words "found elsewhere only or mainly in the medical writers" (see above, p. 49). Of course the cases given are only those found in the 75 pages of Lucian examined for this purpose. The total number of words of this kind to be found in all Lucian's works may be estimated with the help of the word lists in Schmid's *Atticismus* as considerably over 100.

[13] Lagarde, *Psalterium juxta Hebraeos Hieronymi*, 1874, p. 165.

Harvard Theological Studies

I. THE COMPOSITION AND DATE OF ACTS. By Charles Cutler Torrey, Professor of Semitic Languages in Yale University. 72 pages. 1916. $1.00.

II. THE PAULINE IDEA OF FAITH IN ITS RELATION TO JEWISH AND HELLENISTIC RELIGION. By William Henry Paine Hatch, Professor of the Language and Literature of the New Testament in the General Theological Seminary, New York. (Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge.) 92 pages. 1917. $1.00.

III. EPHOD AND ARK. By William R. Arnold, Professor of Hebrew in Andover Theological Seminary. 170 pages. 1917. $1.50.

IV. THE GOSPEL MANUSCRIPTS OF THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY. By Charles Carroll Edmunds, Professor of the Literature and Interpretation of the New Testament in the General Theological Seminary, New York, and William Henry Paine Hatch, Professor in the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge. 68 pages. 1918. $1.25.

V. MACARII ANECDOTA. Edited by G. L. Marriott. Lecturer in the University of Birmingham. 48 pages. 1918. $1.25.

VI. THE STYLE AND LITERARY METHOD OF LUKE. I. THE DICTION OF LUKE AND ACTS. By Henry J. Cadbury, Associate Professor of Biblical Literature and of Greek in Haverford College. 72 pages. 1919. $1.25.

IN PRESS

THE STYLE AND LITERARY METHOD OF LUKE. Part II. By Henry J. Cadbury, Haverford College.

IS MARK A ROMAN GOSPEL? By Benjamin W. Bacon, Professor of New Testament Criticism and Exegesis in Yale University.